

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHEN one takes up a book entitled *The English Bible as Literature*, one's expectations are not pitched very high. The ground has already been traversed so often and so thoroughly, so many able scholars and brilliant writers have already given of their best to this high theme, that it seems all but impossible to say anything that is at once fresh and true. But any one who approaches in such a spirit the book with the above title by Mr. Charles Allen DINSMORE (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) will be very agreeably disappointed. For it is written with a fine blend of restraint and enthusiasm by one who is himself a master of style and who displays throughout a subtle insight not only into the style but into the substance of the Bible.

Here is a critic who possesses the first essential of all sound criticism, namely, the power of appreciation. It is indeed no blind appreciation: Mr. DINSMORE is not afraid to tell us that 'much of the Hebrew poetry is not of the highest order—it ranges from the commonplace and artificial to the very best.' But it is an appreciation which rests upon a sound literary instinct and a wide knowledge of the best in literature, and which leads him to challenge, gently but effectively, the rather irritating dictum of so good a critic as Mr. Middleton Murry, that to him 'it seems scarcely an exaggeration to say that the style of one-half of the English Bible is atrocious. A great part of the historical books of the Old Testament, the Gospels in the New, are examples of all that writing should not be.'

That is a hard saying, and Mr. DINSMORE loves his Bible and especially his Gospels too much to let it pass. He admits that the paragraph from which this comes is a thought-provoking passage, but 'it is not quite true.' After discussing the conditions of effective writing, and showing how truly, if unconsciously, these conditions are fulfilled by the writers of the gospel story, he mildly but with unmistakable point goes on, 'Mr. Murry, were you not speaking a little hastily when you said that "The Gospels are examples of all that writing should not be"? When you made that quick generalization, were you all that a critic should be?'

It is only natural that the soul of one whose literary taste is so exquisite should be vexed by the average modern translation. Over and over again he returns to the attack on recent versions for their colloquial and unmusical quality and their almost studied lack of dignity. He describes 'Look how the lilies of the field grow' as matter-of-fact, cacophonous, almost pert. To transform 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,' into 'Look, there is God's Lamb, who is to remove the world's sin,' is to 'turn an incomparable proclamation into a newspaper headline.' When Jesus is made to say to the woman taken in adultery, 'Be off, and never sin again,' 'these two raucous, brutal words, *Be off*, change divine compassion into petulant annoyance.' And—to mention only one instance more—the great words of the Almighty to Job, presented thus, 'When I

founded the earth, where were you then? Answer me that, if you have wit to know,' have the 'tone of a woman shaking a naughty boy.'

The thing that offends Mr. DINSMORE in translations like these is their failure to translate the emotional quality of the original words. The thought of an original author can be more or less adequately reproduced in the worst of translations; but in a great author the words carry an emotional as well as an intellectual value, and this can be completely obliterated by a translation which is otherwise perfectly accurate, but which brings the reader or the hearer out upon a lower emotional level, or which, by needless colloquialism, may even provoke a certain resentment.

It is just possible that Mr. DINSMORE allows his enthusiasm to run away with him in his deliberate statement that 'the English Bible in the standard versions is a finer and nobler literature than the Scriptures in their original tongues.' It is quite impossible for us, to whom these tongues are alien, to know with any certainty how the original words fell upon the ears of the men to whom those languages were native. Mr. DINSMORE is willing to admit, what indeed no one can deny, that Isaiah's 'thought is clothed in splendour,' and the best translation is likely to do this splendour less than justice. Of course what he means is, in part, that there is a peculiar and perhaps incomparable richness in the English language which to its basic inheritance has added the robustness of the Latin language and the grace of the Greek in the course of its historical development. But Mr. DINSMORE is unquestionably right in insisting that the glory and the wonder of the English Bible lie in its blend of the characteristics of the English and the Hebrew spirit, which in many respects are so strangely akin.

For the Hebrew loves directness, simplicity, and sincerity: he has deep emotions and vivid imaginations; and these too are characteristic of the English genius at its highest. Certainly the conditions under which Hebrew writers worked were, as Mr. DINSMORE points out, favourable to

literary excellence. They looked at life directly, partly because they were living in a smaller world than ours; their intensity was not weakened, as ours is apt to be, by the vastness of the area over which it had to be dissipated. And again—at least for the earlier period—spontaneity was far more easily possible than with us, because there was no great literary inheritance, no models to which writers felt more or less obliged to conform. These conditions make for freshness and originality.

One result of this was—and this is especially conspicuous in the Psalms—a certain 'glad objectivity,' as Mr. DINSMORE happily calls it, about the ancient Hebrew. That, too, is why he does not write tragedy. Because the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, and because the ways of God, however mysterious, are right and good, he does not look at life tragically. Weeping may endure for a night, but after the night the day, and joy cometh in the morning.

Here, as at many points in the book, we feel that Mr. DINSMORE is as well equipped to speak of the spiritual quality of the Bible as of its style. Indeed, we have seldom met anything quite so good as his discussion of the historical books. He is well aware of their deficiencies, considered as historical narrative; he knows that there is often more homily than history. But he also knows, and has the art to set forth in glowing terms, the great purpose which governs all the historical writing, and the mighty conception of history that underlies it. It is inspired throughout by a sense of what he calls 'the active presence of God in human affairs for a vast moral end'; it is 'a vast world progress toward a glorious goal.'

The message of the Hebrew people to mankind is that 'the Supreme Power is a Personal Spirit, graciously and earnestly through individuals and nations, especially through Israel, carrying forward his purpose of the ethical redemption of mankind.' Here the literary critic becomes the spiritual interpreter; and in view of words like these we realize that, when Mr. DINSMORE defines the purpose of his book as to point out 'the secret of the



enchantment of the English Bible, to show how the miracle happened, and to feel the wonder of it,' he gives us more perhaps than we have a right to expect. For he carries us beyond its 'magical sentences' to its spiritual quality and to those deep and abiding things by which men live.

---

In both Jewish and Gentile thought before Christ the *Vision of God* was regarded as a true goal or end of human endeavour. From the Old Testament writers it appears that patriarchs like Jacob and prophets like Isaiah and Ezekiel were held to have experienced the vision. But, as the years drew on, the experience was, as Dr. KIRK says in his Bampton Lectures, 'hedged about with cautions and reservations.' The Divine element in the visions of patriarchs and prophets was not denied, but only of Moses was it allowed that his was a vision of God 'face to face.' The later Jewish position is summed up in the memorable saying from the Mischnah, 'The prophets saw through a dark glass, Moses alone through a clear one.'

---

In Greek religion and philosophy the desire for the vision of God and the conviction of its possibility were also strong. In Plato the beatific vision is a reminiscence or recollection from a former state, yet more than that. For in bidding his disciples to become rapt in the Divine, he promises that once they have put off the 'folly' of the body they shall recapture the beatific vision and see God face to face. With Seneca, as with Plato, the seeing of God is possible in this life, but Seneca promises even more definitely that in the life to come we shall break through the clouds which beset us here and see clearly with no feeble vision.

---

Perhaps, then, it is no exaggeration to say, with Dr. KIRK, that 'Christianity came into a world tantalized with the belief that some men had seen God, and had found in the vision the sum of human happiness; a world aching with the hope that the same vision was attainable by all.'

---

It is surely significant in this connexion that the vision of God was central in St. Paul's teaching, and even more emphatically so in St. John's. To see God was not the only formula used by St. Paul or St. John when they wished to express the fullness of the Christian experience, whether here or hereafter. But the vision of God is the thought to which St. Paul recurs in some at least of his most exalted moments: 'Now we see in a mirror, in a riddle, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I have been known fully.' And it cannot be denied that the thought of the vision of God dominates St. John; the prelude to his First Epistle would come even more fitly if it stood as a footnote to the Fourth Gospel: 'That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we have beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life . . .; that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us.'

---

Thus through St. Paul and St. John Christianity affirms that an unbroken personal intercourse with the Divine is the end for which man was created, and that a foretaste of this experience is possible even in this life. In the centuries that succeeded the age of the apostles the doctrine of the vision of God remained the supreme expression of the Christian ideal. Indeed, it became the central doctrine of the Christian life. This was due in part to the influence of St. Paul, and in greater part to the influence of St. John.

---

But we have yet to name an influence greater still, namely, that of our Lord's promise in the Sixth Beatitude. When He said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God,' He implied that the vision of God is a reward supremely worth gaining; He may even have implied that it is the true goal or highest end of human life.

---

In an excellent and most readable book, *The New Dimensions of Religion*, Mr. Allyn K. FOSTER



(Macmillan; ros. net) sets out 'to state the essential realities and the essential experiences of religion in the prevailing language of science.' Very rightly he gives considerable space to the treatment of what he calls 'the venture of prayer,' for undoubtedly it is at this point that difficulties become acute. Is there a living God to pray to? Can prayer be heard in so vast a world as this? Are answers to prayer excluded by the constitution of Nature? These and such-like questions have tended to create the impression that prayer is ineffective and useless, and unless men believe that prayer is a real power in the universe they will not continue to pray.

One difficulty in the way of prayer is just a sense of the unreality of the spiritual. We all find it difficult to grasp the unseen, and in these days the theory is formulated and pressed upon us that our whole religion is subjective, that God is nothing but a projection of the human mind, a gigantic anthropomorphism. Here physical science offers some help, teaching that all power belongs to the realm of the unseen, that matter itself is but a condensation of invisible energy, and that the whole universe is throbbing with forces which though unfelt are everywhere present. Physical science would seem to have reached the point of saying that in the ultimate analysis of the world the unseen is the only real. Mr. FOSTER makes sport of the accusation that religion is subjective and anthropomorphic. All man's thinking is in one sense subjective, but if it be merely subjective with nothing objective to correspond, its vanity will soon become apparent. If I try to organize my life round the idea that I am a millionaire I shall quickly come to the end of my delusion. But men who have organized their lives round the idea of God have proved its power times without number, have achieved more and risen higher than they would otherwise have done. And as for anthropomorphism, what is that but calling things by names that man is used to, a practice which science itself cannot avoid? Even God can only be spoken of in symbols.

This is no new difficulty, for men of old felt that they were but grasshoppers, and could hardly bring themselves to think that their feeble cry would reach high heaven. But undoubtedly modern astronomy has enhanced the difficulty by its revelation of immense distances and its overwhelming panorama of stars and nebulae. But all these are simply irrelevant when once we have grasped the idea that God is everywhere present. There is no region of the universe remote from Him. Why, then, should we ever think of Him as far away and ourselves as relegated to an all but forgotten corner? The old theological doctrine of *totus ubique* may seem inconceivable, but modern science cannot conceive any other way in which the Power that rules the universe can exercise effective control. If we realize the presence of God the depths of space become irrelevant. It presents no more an obstacle to prayer than it does to our conversation with a friend with whom we are speaking face to face.

Still another difficulty about prayer gathers round the idea that the world is ruled by law so that the order of things is inexorably fixed, and it is irrational to ask or expect it to be changed. There is really no ground in modern science for any such conception. Apart from Heisenberg's Principle of Indeterminacy, which has recently impressed physicists, it may be said with confidence that science is never in a position infallibly to predict an event, for some unknown force may at any moment intervene. The world is fluid and adaptable. Nature is a complex system of laws (if one must call them so), which without violating one another have the effect of interfering so as to suspend each other's action. 'Our universe is a complex, often a paradox, of laws, and there is a fine sociality among them. A naked, inexorable law does not exist. Any number of combinations of opposite forces may be effected and yet each law be severely kept.' By human energy the face of Nature and the order of events can be changed, as we know in our daily experience. If such power be given to man, surely we must believe that in an infinite degree it belongs to his Creator. We cannot think that the Maker of the world has ceased to be able to

A second difficulty in the way of prayer is that the world is so vast that we feel quite lost in it.



control the world which He has made. And if so, then He must be free, to say the least, to answer prayer if He sees good.

But does He, in very deed, answer prayer? Perhaps the greatest difficulty of all is just the feeling that prayer is ineffective. There are innumerable testimonies to the power of prayer, but that does not convince the man who feels that he has prayed, and prayed in vain. In such a case it would be well to examine closely the nature and aim of the prayer. Some prayers are selfish; as St. James says, 'Ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your own lusts.' Some prayers are foolish and could only be granted to our own sorrow and loss. Hence it is but reasonable that we should ever pray in humble submission to the will of God. It is really a bold thing that we do when we pray, taking it upon ourselves to ask the all-wise Ruler of the world to consider our desires and take such action as may bring them to pass. Therefore we must ever

remember that He knows best, and doubtless the richest blessing that prayer brings is just the childlike faith which leads to a loving acquiescence in the fatherly will of God.

'Just as the scientist who conforms to nature's law finds the forces of nature at his disposal in ways he had not dreamed, so submission to God's moral and spiritual will, far from making slaves of us, takes us up into partnership with the Eternal Himself. We discover resources never dreamed of which play upon us and within us according to a law in no sense interfering with any other law. God does not have to play cosmic tricks with His universe to get His will done. Like a provident father, He has thought of all things His children may need. That, at least, is how it seems to those who have made the venture of prayer. They find that all things work together, as do the forces in the universe, for good to them that love God, who are called according to His purpose.'

## Great Attacks on Christianity.

### V. Feuerbach and Illusionism.

BY PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D. PHIL., D.D., EDINBURGH.

FEUERBACH is the classical sceptic in theology, as Hume is in philosophy. One of my old teachers used to say that if he ever felt intellectually stale, a single page of Hume proved an instant cure; and there is something, though not a great deal, of the same tonic quality in the writing of Feuerbach. With this difference, however, that while Hume is nearly always at the top of his form, Feuerbach too often allows his argument to lapse into that monotony of phrase which tends to afflict so much of Hegelian or semi-Hegelian writing on Christianity. His formulas, it is true, are not the authentic Hegelian ones, but they are more or less in their style.

A classic has been defined as a book which seems greater every time you read it. It would be hazardous to claim this supreme quality for Feuerbach, but at least his argument is classical in this respect, that you cannot open him without feeling that his attack on faith is the gravest of all. He

represents, in the intellectual domain, the last enemy of the gospel. A German book, published in 1912, is a striking proof of its importance. This is Kurt Leese's *Die Prinzipienlehre der systematischen Theologie im Lichte der Kritik Ludwig Feuerbachs*. Leese there urged that the theology of the nineteenth century had taken Feuerbach much too lightly. Not that its representatives quite neglected him; but on the whole they treated him as an eccentric outsider who need not be faced seriously. In time the delusion grew up that he had been successfully refuted, the truth being that at no time had they come to terms with him, or realized the strength of his position. After stating Feuerbach's main contentions once more, in their full weight, Leese goes on to argue that these have never been properly met. Not merely have the Ritschlians failed to stand up to him; the same is true of men like Lipsius, Kaehler, and Schlatter. They all think



so anthropocentrically, he holds, that as against Feuerbach they are totally without defence. They are more concerned with man than with God, so playing into the enemy's hands. And he insists that the first thing we have to do is to understand clearly what Feuerbach was driving at, to confront his positions at their strongest, and to cease slaying an opponent who, as we imagine him, is apt to be no more than a childish caricature of the reality. Without admitting the truth of Leese's indictment, we may at least accept his book as a tribute to the significance of what Feuerbach was trying to say. Much the same line is taken by Karl Barth, more briefly but with immensely more vigour and penetration, in an address published in 1928.

Ludwig Feuerbach was born in 1804. He studied theology in Heidelberg under Daub, a theologian of speculative hue, and philosophy in Berlin from 1824 onwards, under Hegel. In 1828 he began to teach philosophy in the University of Erlangen. But his academic career was a failure, and soon he withdrew into the seclusion and what seems, in his case, to have been the penury of a private scholar. He died in 1872. For us his chief works are the *Essence of Christianity* (1841), the *Philosophy of the Future* (1843), and the *Essence of Religion* (1853), this last being a series of public lectures delivered in 1848, the year of revolution. The first of these three books was translated into English by no less a person than George Eliot, the novelist. His earliest work had been an anonymous attack on the doctrine of immortality.

Feuerbach remained a theologian all his life, in the sense that all the time he thought and wrote about theology. The same year, 1841, which saw the publication of his book on the essence of Christianity, saw also the issue of a two-volume work by Strauss on Dogmatics, in which that famous New Testament critic approaches Christian doctrine in the spirit of a man who comes not to praise, but to bury. And yet Feuerbach was the more radical of the two. Under the auspices of Hegelianism, a beautiful day of peace seemed then to have dawned upon the relations of theology and philosophy. As Strauss remarked, the wolf was on the point of lying down with the lamb. Yet it was only the calm before the storm. Strauss wished to destroy Christianity, but Feuerbach was bent on uprooting religion in every shape and form.

If we are to believe himself, his chief interest lay in unmasking Hegelianism, the thought of his old master. 'My philosophy of religion,' he writes, 'so far from being an explication of the Hegelian, sprang from sheer opposition to it, and it is only

in the light of this opposition that it be understood or judged.' What he opposed, however, was not the principle of Hegelian thinking on religion, but only its application; what Hegel took (on his own terms) as a defence of Christianity, Feuerbach read as its death-warrant. He scoffed at theology for having let the Hegelians take charge of it, and denounced the alliance as a piece of intellectual cant. Like the great Berlin philosopher, he strove to deduce religion from immanent principles of cognition; with the result that whatever religion turns out to be, in its ultimate essence, it will be something man is *bound* to have, whether or not he wants to have it. It will be as inseparable from his nature as his five senses. But this, right at the start, is a view of religion which for Christian judgment is inevitably wrong. It totally ignores the fact that, on the one hand, genuine religion in the Christian sense is not something a man possesses already, simply in virtue of his manhood, but something freely bestowed on him by the sovereign grace of God. On the other hand, it is something he can only have by personal decision. Alike from the divine point of view and the human, it cannot be anything so obvious as a natural endowment. Grace and faith make it something poles apart from that.

It is important to understand how Feuerbach sprang out of Hegel, and then turned against him. Hegel, particularly in his earlier thought, insisted that man does stand in a real relationship to the Transcendent; but what this actually means is that the human mind objectifies its own infinite life and, thus endowing it with a *quasi* trans-subjective character, pictured in imagination, takes up towards it the attitude specifically known as religion. To do this is to worship. God, so understood, is the reflection of our own deepest being, our real self hypostatized. Plato defined thought as a dialogue which the soul holds with itself, no doubt meaning by this, at least in part, that thought involves not merely a reference to an object thought about, but also a reference to other persons with whom the thought is shareable. But Hegel seemed to press the idea further. His statements, without any forcing of their terms, could be read as asserting that God is the human self in a certain infinite aspect. Feuerbach read them so, and forthwith proceeded indignantly to argue that in that case the Hegelian pretence of substantial or constructive agreement with the faith of the Christian Church must be abandoned once and for ever. God is not merely a helpful personification of the infinitude of man's nature; there is no other God but man,



who is the measure of all things. Man is religious in so far as he projects his own nature into the Transcendent. Religion claims to base itself upon the 'otherness' of God, upon a differentiating gulf between God and man; but in point of fact, when we look more closely, the gulf or distinction lies within the man himself. Exact scrutiny shows that in the religious experience the human soul all the time moves exclusively within its own limits. Knowledge of God is not false, if only we interpret it accurately; it is a genuine knowledge possessed by the Ego of its own being. If we may put it so, the transcendence of the individual's life which all religion implies is a transcendence that measures not vertically but horizontally—not upwards, but round us on our own level. Feuerbach, whether consistently or not, shrinks from saying that in piety the single self envisages itself adoringly; the infinitude necessary to the religious object he finds in the human race. The race bounds and overarches my puny personal existence, evoking thereby a specifically religious feeling. But since the race is only myself indefinitely multiplied, the argument can quite well be carried on in terms of self as a single entity. And this means that transcendence, eventually, is a vain and empty word. To lay hold of a God other than myself, and enter into relations with Him, is a fruitless effort to escape from my own limits. We have to translate God into terms of man, remembering always that the translation, to be correct, must rest on the insight that human terms can be made to exhaust the meaning of the original, and leave nothing unexpressed. In sober truth, theology is anthropology and nothing more. 'God,' he writes, 'was my first, reason my second, man my last and final thought.' The Absolute Spirit of the Hegelian system has now shrunk into the single human spirit, reverently contemplating humanity as a race. The element or aspect of transcendence which Hegel had discerned in human existence as something which the philosophical scalpel could dissect and analyse, is pilloried by Feuerbach as self-deception. Religion is but the apotheosis of man; all theology proper has been a mistake, pathetic or amusing as it may be viewed, from the beginning. To it, once the queen of the sciences, we seem to hear Feuerbach say, in the words of Greek tragedy:

May'st thou ne'er know the truth of what thou art.

Thus Feuerbach's aim is not to destroy religion, but to canalize it anthropologically. He strives to show how the illusion of transcendent Godhead

arises in us all by a psychological necessity, and can be cured by appropriate philosophical remedies. Let us only put our minds to school with Hegel; let us draw from his principles not perhaps the conclusion he intends, but yet that which his assumptions imply, and religion with the supramundane interest it has hitherto manifested will reveal itself as little better than a nervous complaint. God, conceived as a Being of whom are all things and to whom are all things, is the product of phantasy, a mirage created by our own emotional thought, nothing better in the last resort than a glorified facsimile of man.

If, then, man is the *ens realissimum*, beyond which, by the nature of the case, our minds cannot reach, what is man? With a concrete realism, in which it must not be forgotten he has the Bible on his side, Feuerbach insists that man is, essentially, an embodied self. He is not the Ego of Kant or any abstract entity of pure reason, but a being very close to sense. Indeed, once Feuerbach has expunged Deity and therefore also the God-ward aspect of human life which the New Testament means by 'spirit,' man becomes for him a being purely of sense. As he puts it: 'The body, in its totality, is my Ego, my very essence.' We may extend Feuerbach's aphorism, and say that if theology is anthropology, anthropology just as clearly is physiology. The body is the predominant partner, for the real, strictly taken, is that which is perceptible by the senses. This important fact, that in theory of knowledge Feuerbach is a thorough-going sensationalist, must not be overlooked. In consequence, man can do no more than project his own self into reality, his imagination lending objective existence to the hypothetical irresistible causes of sensation. Thus proofs of the being of God are unconsciously aimed at the externalization of what is inward, positing it as somehow separate from man and thereby, as is supposed, attesting the reality of man himself. They are only, writes Feuerbach, varied and highly interesting forms in which man affirms his own being.

So, again, in ethics Feuerbach is a hedonist, though by no means one of an ignoble type. Self-love underlies all practical life, and my self-love is out invariably for my own happiness with a desire limited only by similar impulses in other people. From this point he takes a leap, as arbitrary and illogical as that taken by other hedonists, to the position that the supreme ethical end is the welfare of the race. By a happy inconsistency, he so handles these hedonistic assumptions as to extract from them an appeal for genuine philanthropy.



We rub our eyes incredulously when we find him protesting that, in spite of a sensationalism which is virtually indistinguishable from materialism, his denial of the existence of God is in no sense a negation of moral principles, since these principles have their reality in themselves and are such as shine by their own light.

To sum up, then, concentrating all his strength on the religious problem, Feuerbach taught that religion is the product of the imagination, in which man endows with a spurious transcendence what actually is his relation to his own being. We turn our wishes into realities, then take refuge under their supposed greatness. As he puts it: 'What thou needest—needest on inward grounds—that, and that only, is thy God.' In religion man seeks humanity—the race—in order to free himself from dependence on Nature; but while for science humanity is here an abstract idea, in religion the unconscious use of the fancy bestows on the race an imagined concreteness and turns it into God. Barth has two striking pages in his essay, from which we may draw for a moment, where he traverses the entire round of the Christian doctrines, and shows by extracts from Feuerbach what these become once he has subjected them to his special illusionistic treatment. God is the self-feeling of man freed from all the limitations of reality. In the personality of God man celebrates the supernatural and immortal character of his own personal being. The absoluteness of God represents the effort of human thought to reach by abstraction an absolute datum for reflection. The infinity of God is in the last resort identical with the infinity of the human race as contrasted with the finitude of the individual. We differentiate the direct and non-discursive knowledge of God from the lower piece-by-piece knowledge of man, but this in fact is only the distinction within our own thinking between knowledge *a priori* and *a posteriori*. We call God 'love,' because we have formed a picture of a Being that will satisfy all our dreams and hopes—He is the personified sigh of the soul. Faith in providence is a conviction of our own worth as immensely superior to that of the world. When we speak of the Incarnation, we are glorifying to the ideal limit the pathos of human sympathy. When religion says 'God suffers,' the wise will regard this as a fanciful rendering of the notion that human suffering is a divine thing. Omnipotence is the self-sufficient subjectivity of man turned into a cosmic principle. Christ is the race-consciousness thrown into a single idealized figure; anybody is Christ who rises to the plane of loving man for

man's own sake. Miracle is the magical power of fancy to solve the difficulties of life. The Resurrection is the satisfied longing of the human heart to persist in being after death. The Holy Spirit is but the human soul, in its urgent or enthusiastic character, objectified by itself. The Trinity is only the personified social impulse of man. Prayer is the expression of confidence that the needs of the heart constitute, as it were, the destiny and necessity that preside over the world; in prayer the heart is in an absolute relation to itself (here it is convenient to ignore the hall-mark of authentic Christian prayer, 'Thy will be done'). The pattern of all these formulations obviously is the same. Feuerbach stands ready with an idealistic apparatus into which any doctrine you mention may be inserted, and all the results or products can be trusted to exhibit a family resemblance. All are variations of the theme: God is—He is nothing more than—the means to human existence and blessedness. And He is a means which the inevitable functioning of our mind has contrived.

Feuerbach, of course, turns a deaf ear to the believer's protest that his knowledge of God has come to him by revelation—a revelation in which God took the initiative. To him faith in revelation is the final and convincing proof that his illusionistic theory is sound. What is revelation, after all, but man talking to himself? When it speaks of a self-revealing God, the devout mind really starts from itself, makes a detour by an imagined object it calls God, and returns to itself again. Such a faith is at bottom the immediate certainty of the pious mind that what it believes or wishes or imagines, is fact. As a man is, so will his God be. In the end it is put without reserve: 'Man is the beginning, the centre, and the end of religion.' Study the soul, and you know what Christianity must be.

It is significant that Feuerbach has no interest in ascertaining who or what Christ actually was. For Christ, the real God of the Christians, is but an idealized conglomerate of the excellences which man can conceive. We need not, indeed, argue that because the Jesus represented in the New Testament is an entity constructed by the imagination, no person called Jesus ever existed. Imagination always has something to work on. But it is lost labour if we attempt to distinguish between the facts of history and the fanciful additions of faith. We have no trustworthy data for any such effort. Beyond the circumstance that the Figure presented in the New Testament is a product of desire, a wish-fulfilment, we cannot go. Men have dreamt of a perfect realization of the moral ideal;



they have yearned for that which would appease conscience; and under the impulse of these longings they have constructed a purely ideal Christ. Once possessed of this fancied perfect Saviour, they have become culpably indifferent, or even blind, to the vision and challenge of cultural progress. The same craven other-worldly escape from a call to the hard toil of civilization they have found in the hope of an immortality of bliss. As Feuerbach puts it roundly, his aim has been to change his hearers 'from friends of God to friends of man, from believers to thinkers, from devotees to workers, from candidates for the next world to students of this one, from Christians whose creed makes them half animal, half angel, to men who are complete men.' And who shall say that this accusation, winged as it may be by clever malice, does not bring something home to our conscience that humbles us in the presence of God? The indifference of the Church to, say, the hardship and misery of the workers during the Industrial Revolution is no very pleasant thing to reflect upon; nor is the temper of the Church at this hour regarding the inhumanities of the social order what it might be, or what, according to the mind of Jesus, it ought to be. As we read Feuerbach's fierce indictment, we might do worse than imitate the spirit of David when he said of Shimei: 'Let him curse, for the Lord hath bidden him.'

Even to contemporary theology, as we must admit, Feuerbach was putting questions which could not be lightly brushed aside as meaningless. It is quite possible that leading Christian thinkers had too often stated the case for the gospel in ways that actually invited a theory of illusionism, or at all events displayed an ambiguity which made such a view not wholly grotesque. Did not Luther say in passing that it is faith that makes both God and idol? Did not Schleiermacher say that in the ideal theology there would be no objective statements about God at all, but only descriptions of the believing consciousness? This is not in the least to urge that Schleiermacher and Feuerbach thought alike, for the religious feeling which in Feuerbach's view is an unbridled egoism projecting selfish desires into the 'immense inane,' is for Schleiermacher the specific mode in which the devout mind intuitively apprehends the Supreme Reality. None the less, it is clear that if the Christian mind is to make any respectable answer to those who, like Feuerbach, Freud, or Leuba, consider religion to be illusion created by feeling, it must not commit such mistakes in formulation as Ritschl did in saying that religion is 'the spiritual instrument

which man possesses to free himself from the natural conditions of his life.' In words, this is very much what Feuerbach said; yet we ought not to forget the Latin proverb, *si duo idem dicunt, non est idem*. The whole diameter of being lies between the man who uses the common formula with his eye upon the revelation of God in Christ, and the man who uses it with the assumption that there is no God to be revealed. Only, in that case, the formula itself, capable of being employed thus equivocally, must be wrong.

Shall we then say that the simple reason why Feuerbach has been more or less evaded, or at least underrated as an opponent, by nineteenth-century theology, is that he is unanswerable? By no means; to answer him is not difficult, if only the principle be kept well in mind that no truth which concerns spiritual reality can be so stated or defended that it *must* convince every normal mind. Feuerbach against Christianity is not certain knowledge against mere faith; it is one faith or creed against another, and no argument in the world will dispense a serious man from *voting* in this controversy; he has to gather himself together and arrive at the fateful decision by personal insight. It is affectation to speak as if this were not so.

In a certain sense, I should be quite willing to admit that Feuerbach cannot be *refuted*, if we add that this is a fact of no particular importance. Many statements are incapable of refutation, yet they are rejected out of hand. Solipsism, for example—the doctrine that nothing exists outside my own mind and its contents—cannot be put down by any inescapable theoretical logic; though we can, of course, point out that by discussing the subject the solipsist gives away his case in fact. He admits the reality of other people whom he desires to convince. The belief that others exist is, then, a fundamental faith essential to specifically human life; but if its truth be denied, I cannot refute the denial. Or quite grotesque examples may be taken. If I am told that Abraham Lincoln was at heart a scoundrel, or that at the very centre of the moon there is a substance which (if we could get hold of it) would cure all human diseases, or that the world will end next year—or a hundred other absurdities—I cannot prove that these statements are false; none the less they make no impression. We need not, therefore, be in the least perturbed by the fact that Feuerbach is, in a sense, irrefutable.

In another sense, he can be refuted definitely enough. That is to say, it can be shown that he is





left with much greater difficulties on his hands than his opponents are. Let us take one point. Hartmann, the philosopher of pessimism, who certainly held no brief for religion, has pointed out that if Feuerbach prides himself on the cogency of his argument, it becomes necessary to call attention to the fact that his case rests on what is nothing better than an obvious logical fallacy. His one original idea is that God is but a projected desire of the human heart. Now it is plain that things do not exist simply because we wish for them; but it does not in the least follow that things do not exist, because we wish for them. Because I long for the dawn, it cannot be validly argued that the dawn will not arrive. Christian thinkers have often urged, *e.g.*, that immortality is real on account of the intensity with which it is desired; and people like Feuerbach are ready to protest against all such reasoning; but his own criticism of religion and the entire proof offered for his atheism are just as poor in logic as the other side. Call God a wish-fulfilment, and absolutely nothing follows either for His existence or His non-existence. What does follow is simply that we have to exercise critical care in scrutinizing the arguments for and against.

Let us look once more at Feuerbach's general argument that religion, being a fiction born of desire, does not bring the human spirit into contact with an extra-human reality, but merely projects its fears and hopes upon the empty canvas of the universe. That is, he cannot see that there is anything in Christian religion, as faith in a transcendent God, except a rather pathetic self-deception of the devout heart. Is there not here something curiously like the attitude of the man who is totally without a sense of humour? We all know how a man afflicted by this kind of mental deficiency can be heard arguing that a joke over which his friends are smiling has nothing comical in it at all. He will even proceed to prove his point. He will take the sentence or sentences in which the alleged jest is enunciated, carefully examine and analyse their constituent parts, and give a heavy and detailed demonstration that they fail to convey anything worthy of laughter. Now it is often difficult to answer such an objector, and the wise man will not try to. He will simply say to himself that one either sees a joke or one does not. The other, he will conclude, is colour-blind in this region, and, like all the colour-blind, is apt to conclude that what he does not see is not there. That one man does not have a certain experience, and finds nothing in it when it is described to him,

is no reason for supposing that others, in just that experience, may not be brought in contact with a supra-mundane Reality, which, in sheer grace, has spoken to him commandingly and laid hands irresistibly upon his life.

Again, it is in the name of theory of knowledge that Feuerbach pronounces sentence of death upon religion, but his own flimsy theory of knowledge scarcely entitles him to talk down to faith. While it may have had a temporary victory over a philosophy that constructed the world out of logical ideas, it is itself a rather crass form of sensationalism. Knowledge, for him, is a product of the mere rain of sense-impressions, though how on such terms the meaning of impressions could be apprehended, he of course cannot explain. Anyhow, in his hands, this sensationalistic epistemology involves the conclusion that man can know nothing but himself, his sensations and his needs. It perhaps sounds more impressive to state this in universal terms by saying that man can only know man; but, on the presuppositions we are considering, this is to go much beyond our data; for, if my personal sense-impressions be all, Feuerbach is justified in saying no more than 'I know only those occurrences which I myself experience.' And this is solipsism, as we have seen. Now, if Feuerbach, like other people, can only escape from solipsism into the external world by the exercise of the fundamental faith that knowledge is always of the non-self—that in cognition the mind is not merely moving within itself but is in the specific and *sui generis* relationship of a cognizing mind to the cognized reality—and if his sensationalistic theory of knowledge definitely vetoes this faith, then certain rather important consequences follow. One of these may be indicated. God is an illusion, we are told, because what I apprehend is only my own sense-impressions and my own desires. But does not science, then, come under the same condemnation? Start from Feuerbach's premises, and *all* knowledge is illusion. For now all you can say is that knowledge emerges accidentally out of the strictly determined sequence of sense-impressions in the mind; but this sequence produces error no less than true belief. All our beliefs, in short, are inevitable, and the difference between what are called veridical beliefs and those which are erroneous has vanished. Thus a theorist like Feuerbach is bound to saw off the branch on which he is sitting; the epistemology which he uses to discredit faith proves fatal also to that scientific reflection in whose name he speaks. We are free once more to form our own ideas as to what can be known and what cannot.



Finally, as a writer quoted by Karl Barth summarily declares, Feuerbach's mind has two blind spots which disqualify his theory of religion from the outset. He ignores death and he disregards sin. It must be remembered that his argument essentially is that in religious thinking man deifies man. But man is the prey of death and is sinful through and through; is it a convincing theory, or even a fairly plausible one, that the materials for our conception of the Lord of heaven and earth are drawn from what we find in our own life of pathetic sin and decay? Is it not a vital mark of religion that, in spite of all the real truth that belongs to anthropomorphism, an object is worthy of my reverence not when it is simply like me, but only when it is *also* unlike? I can only worship what in some sense is 'wholly other.' Nothing which is merely an extension of the self, and which, therefore, cannot fail to be infected with the partialities and imperfections of the self, can evoke the specifically religious response. Aspirations after what are, in the long run, purely human values, are not good enough for the devout mind. Hence, to theorists on religion, we are entitled to say: Derive religion, if you choose, from the glories of nature or the sublimities of the moral

order, or from any other source where you suppose the transcendent powers of destiny have their seat. But, pray, whatever happens, do not ask us to believe that poor mortals, confined to their own experience, have found in what they are, as sinners fated to sink into the grave, the content out of which they have built the conception of the Lord God, eternal and high and lifted up, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity.

*Fas est ab hoste doceri.* Feuerbach's interpretation of religion is a grave indictment of any theology which, for reasons however commendable, has failed to give the majesty of God a fundamental and determinative place. To make God primarily the trustee of man's interests, even if these interests be ethical and soteriological, is courting trouble. The first thing declared in Scripture concerning God is that He is the Creator, sovereignly absolute over nature and man; and no other conception gives a meaning charged with its true weight and fullness to the thought of His supreme and binding Holy Will. No other preserves the wonder of His compassionate grace to the sinful. The God of Christian faith is in no sense a means to our ends, even the ends of redemption: He is the Lord, whom we and all things serve.

---

## Literature.

### THE NATURAL AND THE SUPERNATURAL.

THERE is no exaggeration in saying that *The Natural and the Supernatural*, by Principal John Oman (Cambridge University Press; 18s. net), is in many ways the most distinctive contribution to a philosophy of religion the century has produced. It is the ripe fruit of years of devoted study and meditation on the subject of religion by a scholar of profound wisdom, of immense learning, and of deep spiritual insight. 'Religion is apparently thought to be so peculiar that interest in it is necessarily bias,' says the writer. This volume is in itself a massive and crushing refutation of such a crude opinion, and the few brilliant pages devoted to 'interest' as a necessity for understanding ought to be read by all psychologists.

Every one of the five hundred pages reveals the author's keen desire for truth—truth in regard to the highest and holiest—and he tracks error to its lair so as to expose it to the sunlight of reality. There

is no false cleverness here, no desire to gain a verbal victory, but a passion there is for progressive insight which gleams through every sentence. This is not a text-book for immature students—nor an armoury of facts or opinions—it takes for granted all that the text-books can furnish; it is rather a philosophy of the philosophies of religion, and great good would be effected if every teacher of the subjects of the philosophy, the psychology, and the history of religions were compelled by an intellectual edict of some sort to read this volume before they wrote or spoke hereafter.

This volume covers an immense field, and it is not easy reading. There is an Aristotelian brevity and pith in every sentence so that the five hundred pages could have been extended to five thousand without serious dilution—indeed this is, I fancy, what the writer himself must have done for his own students, and this is certainly what any other teacher taking this volume as a text-book for a seminar must do.

It is impossible here to give any adequate idea



of the wealth of material, of the wide range covered, and above all of the brilliancy of the treatment. Sentences of distinctive quality stand out like jewels, and whole sections abide in the mind like a hidden heaven. We might mention his treatment of hypocrisy and his evaluation of Shakespeare's apprehensive grasp of reality and many more of equal insight. The main argument is that religion deals with the supernatural through the natural—and so all theories of religion which make it illusory, either psychological or metaphysical, are themselves illusions. This is done critically and constructively. A true theory of knowledge follows which is a valuable and original contribution to epistemology. Then the writer proceeds to deal with freedom and necessity—a field in which earlier he showed his competence and mastery. His discussion of conscience is of extraordinary importance. Lastly, we have a treatment of the evanescent and the eternal where he deals with the different historical religions. Here the most distinctive chapter is that on Mysticism to which also he devotes an appendix, and almost equally persuasive, though not quite, is his treatment of prophecy. Then there are some ten appendices, for example, 'The Holy,' 'Primitive Monotheism,' etc.

Some objections might be raised to his use of 'individual' and 'individuality,' of 'nature' and 'supernatural,' but these are verbal objections, nor do they in any way mar the reasonableness of the main thesis or diminish the value of the movement and cogency of the argument.

This book may not be read by the many, but it will be read by the few who, in matters of thought, ultimately determine the opinions of the many. No future treatment of the philosophy of religion can safely neglect a serious perusal of this book.

#### THE RELIGIOUS A PRIORI.

Some minds work best under high pressure. Some of the best books have been written by men who to all appearance were so much occupied with practical affairs that it came as an amazing revelation that by gathering up the fragments of their time they could produce such a work. The latest example of this is furnished by the Rev. Rees Griffiths, B.D., Ph.D., who amid 'the stress of activities and the heat of battle' has contrived to give us a book of outstanding merit on the Philosophy of Religion, entitled *God in Idea and Experience; or, The a priori Elements of the Religious Consciousness: An Epistemological Study* (T. & T. Clark; 10s. 6d. net).

There is a Foreword of a rather unusual kind by the Very Rev. W. P. Paterson. It is not the customary kindly introduction of a new writer by an eminent scholar. It is itself a valuable historical introduction and contribution to the subject, and incidentally supplies the only omission of which Dr. Griffiths has been guilty—a reference to the views of Fries. We recommend a perusal of the Foreword both before and after Dr. Griffiths' own weighty contribution has been read.

Dr. Griffiths has written a most readable book. Even when the most abstruse points are under discussion the style remains crisp and lucid. It is a really valuable work which is much needed, and will, we hope, find a wide welcome not only among theological students and clergy, but among the well-read lay Christian public, many of whom have been somewhat disturbed by some recent theistic or anti-theistic speculation. All such may be assured that here is a live, up-to-date volume, fully abreast of present-day movements of thought, by a writer who is obviously master of the important literature on the subject.

There are two sections, a critical and a constructive. It is the former that is chiefly in our minds when we describe this as a much needed book; for some recent views as to the origin and basal nature of religion have perplexed not a few. Dr. Griffiths is a critic in the best sense. He does not merely show up faults and fallacies, but with eminent fairness shows how much truth there is, and how far short it comes, in the views he considers.

Most insidious and dangerous of all modern speculations as to the origin and nature of religion are those of writers like Leuba who, following the 'new psychology,' explain God as a 'projection' from the mysterious depths of the human Unconscious. Nothing strikes as more valuable than the masterly discussion in which the author reveals the self-contradiction which this view involves. 'Either religion is the expression of true and real human experience and needs, or it is not. If it is not, then it will be a vain quest to search, by a study of religious ideas and practices for their underlying human interests, because, *ex hypothesi*, there is no necessary connexion between them. If it is . . . then it cannot be pronounced an illusion, because, *ex hypothesi*, its claim to reality, subjectively and objectively, is on a par with conscious human experience itself. From this dilemma there seems to be no escape.'

Other views are considered which attempt to base religion on something non-religious, making it



the completion of moral philosophy, the idealization of experience, and so on. No such view, the writer believes and shows, does adequate justice to religion.

The ground thus cleared, he proceeds to unfold his own view. That view is essentially an emended form of the doctrine brilliantly expounded by Hocking in his 'Philosophy of Religious Experience'; but Dr. Griffiths arrives at this by his own way. Religion, he holds, is not derived by reflection upon experience; it is presupposed in all the experience of a self-conscious subject. 'Self-consciousness is only possible in so far as I am able to find in the object not only a reality other than myself, but a reality expressive of Another Mind who knows me through my awareness of the object; in knowing I am always known.' We cannot show here how this position is arrived at, nor how it is explained and safe-guarded from misunderstanding. We are not prepared to say that all the arguments will command universal assent. We do say that the whole discussion is sober, suggestive, and stimulating.

We have before us a very meritorious work which not only deserves but will fruitfully repay careful study.

### THE IDEA OF GOD.

The versatile Dean Shailer Mathews has discussed with wide learning and much insight *The Growth of the Idea of God* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). In this book he defends with real cogency the thesis that that idea grows *pari passu* with the development of the social order and of political and intellectual experience, and that no one really understands it who is not historically and socially minded. The thesis is stated most succinctly on p. 183, where he says: 'As the idea of God has grown in response to changed social conditions and modes of thought in the past, so it is growing now'; and more fully on p. 91: 'As when long ago the Jewish group, with Jewish literature, Jewish hopes, a Jewish Messiah, and a Jewish God became a Hellenistic movement with a God described by philosophy and possessed of imperial efficiency, so now a civilization dominated by physical and biological sciences, seeking new control of natural forces, new social and economic justice, is shaping an enlarged and satisfying idea of its God. But the process is by no means without struggle. As Jahweh faced the Baalim, so the Christian God faces science and the machine.'

In illustration of this thesis the great thinkers

of the past and present are passed in review—Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, the English deists, Eddington, Whitehead, and many more. Anselm's argument, for example, which rises out of feudal conditions which demanded satisfaction for injured honour, would, it is maintained, be quite impossible in a democracy or a constitutional monarchy; and in general, Christianity is the progressive modification of early Christian experience and thought by its contact with Western civilization, which, on the other hand, it has itself done very much to modify. The powerful system of Calvinism, which is 'logically impregnable,' is conditioned in part by political ideas of sovereignty, and 'the one serious question that could be raised was as to whether the pattern of sovereignty was final'; the rise of democracy must inevitably lead to the modification of that dominant idea. It is this indissoluble interrelation of theological ideas and social behaviour or conceptions that sometimes seems to render the missionary's work so disappointing: the former run so far ahead of the latter that 'primitive customs are constantly re-emerging to condition the newly accepted religious teaching.'

The long argument issues in a striking chapter on 'A Contemporary God.' The political concept of sovereignty, it is argued, can no longer function as a final pattern for Deity; we are living in a world dominated by scientific conceptions, and it is to these that our religious thinking, if it is vital, must be related. This is what Dean Mathews seeks to do in his highly suggestive and constructive discussion, which argues that the term God must include the reality of the cosmic activities capable of personal response. It is thus both realistic and theistic, though differing from conventional theism in that it is not strictly metaphysical. It can and 'indeed must utilize the appropriate data of science without being limited to the impersonal area of science.' It is good, at this time of day, to see a kind word spoken for Butler and Henry Drummond. 'Even at the present time Butler's general conception of analogy, as carried forward by Henry Drummond and others who are in touch with modern scientific thought, has its place in a world-view.'

### CONGREGATIONALISM AND CATHOLICISM.

The centenary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales has been commemorated by the issue of a volume, *Essays Congregational and Catholic*, edited by Dr. Albert Peel (Independent

Press; 7s. 6d. net). The writers include Professor C. H. Dodd, Dr. Sydney Cave, Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Dr. Cadoux, Dr. Micklem, Dr. Robert Mackintosh, Principal Selbie, Dr. R. F. Horton, Principal Garvie, and Principal Grieve, and among the subjects are The Church in the New Testament, Congregationalism Essential and Relative, Congregationalism the True Catholicism, Dogma and Freedom, Congregationalism and the Great Christian Doctrines, The Preaching of the Gospel and the Atonement. We need hardly say, because it is obvious, that with such a team of writers and such subjects the book is a fascinating one. A good deal of it is quite free from polemic. Dr. Horton on 'Interpreting the Gospel to Changing Times' is admirable, and one is thankful for quite a good deal of this positive and helpful matter. But the book is largely a vindication and a challenge, and, almost necessarily, controversial. The title, for example, 'Essays Congregational and Catholic,' was surely selected as a kind of flag flung out in face of 'Essays Catholic and Critical.' And some of the essays are very polemical, and rightly so. Dr. Cadoux, whose contribution is one of the ablest and most interesting in the book, says quite seriously that the Church is universal and becomes localized, as it were, in separate congregations, and that this is the true catholicism. Moreover, neither Romanism nor Anglicanism can be called a church at all, because they narrow the universal Church to a sect. It may be imagined how much Dr. Cadoux enjoyed writing this. It is a nasty one for the so-called 'churches.' It is perhaps deserved, though it reminds us a little of the exclamation of the fond Scots mother who was watching her son's regiment march past: 'See, they're a' oot o' step but oor Jock.'

It would not be fitting to indulge in any controversial criticism of this volume here. We owe too much to men like those mentioned, and their great predecessors, and the gospel owes too much to them for any belittling of their witness or the witness of their Churches. It is a splendid history that is vindicated here. And it is finely and worthily presented to us. No doubt some readers will ask: *Can there be such a thing as Congregationalism as a witness?* Is not the notice in the preface by the editor, 'It is perhaps necessary to say that each writer speaks for himself alone,' a definite answer? But any readers who are left asking such questions will forget them in appreciation of the contribution which these essays make to a better understanding of some of the finest of their fellow-believers. We congratulate all who have

co-operated to make this memorial volume so worthy of its theme.

### THE SUPRA-RATIONAL IN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

*Scepticism and Construction* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net) is an able and well-written book, engaging alike in its caution and its candour. The author is Mr. Charles A. Campbell, Lecturer in Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. His aim is to defend and develop Bradley's metaphysical scepticism and, on the basis of it, to offer certain positive views in the domain of human values. He is convinced that Reality is supra-rational, but this conviction is not solely, perhaps even not chiefly, derived from the analysis of knowledge; it is confirmed by the facts of freedom and moral obligation and by the principle of moral valuation, all of which imply, says Mr. Campbell, a supra-rational or non-intelligible Reality. But it is to the final discussion that our readers will most readily turn, in which the attempt is made to enlist the religious consciousness in the service of the theory.

This chapter is addressed to those who believe in the autonomy of the religious experience and agree that any genuine religious experience must include the two features of serenity of soul and moral fervour. A religious consciousness so constituted, it is maintained, can only preserve itself from being rent asunder by internal contradiction by recognizing the supra-rational character of Reality.

Rejecting the facile solution of the 'Finite God,' but refusing to relegate religion with Bosanquet to the realm of 'appearance,' Mr. Campbell invokes the aid of Rudolf Otto in contending that there is no contradiction between the faith of religion in a God whose perfection is supra-rational and the moral urge of religion to banish all imperfection. He adds that if religion stands or falls with the Supra-rational God, then only a metaphysic at least closely resembling the Bradleian is compatible with the validity of religious experience.

The creed to which Mr. Campbell is led is as follows: 'I believe in an Infinite God, who is Perfect with a Perfection that transcends human conception, and with whom I enter into such union as befits a finite being by whole-hearted devotion to my ideal of good.' We welcome his *credo*, but we ask him to reconsider his intransigence in respect of theology and the doctrine of personal mediation.



THE BIBLE AND MODERN  
RESEARCH.

Mr. A. Rendle Short, M.D., B.S., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., has written a thoroughly interesting and useful book on *The Bible and Modern Research* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 6s. net). It is written in what may be roughly called the neo-conservative spirit, but it is marked by a sanity, a modesty, and an absence of vituperation which are often lamentably absent from traditionalist defences of the faith. The facts of the Bible elicit criticism from many angles, and Dr. Short has dealt in turn with—to mention only a few—the challenges from the side of geology, evolution, archæology, psychology, literary criticism, and the moral difficulties of the Old Testament. It is obvious that no one can to-day be an expert in all these departments, but Dr. Short has a wide range of interest and an open eye, and he knows where to go for his authorities. In spite of the temperate tone of his discussion, he has sometimes, doubtless unintentionally, been a little less than fair to Biblical critics, as when he speaks of Deuteronomy and a certain prophecy of Isaiah as being ‘palmed off’ on the king or the people. Many critics would resent as keenly as Dr. Short such a representation of the facts. Nor is it just to say that ‘the destructive critics’—the word is significant and we do not like it—‘have declared that the Book of Daniel is a late forgery.’ Nor do we understand how any one who has ever read the Book of Deuteronomy can write, ‘Take D—who wrote it? Certainly not a prophet; *it is all ritual.*’ In defence of the miraculous element in the stories of Elijah and Elisha he writes: ‘It was necessary that God should demonstrate in some way or other that these were His messengers and that His accredited servants must not be despised.’ This will hardly carry conviction to a modern mind; nor will his defence of Paul’s emphasis on ‘seed’ rather than ‘seeds’ in Gal 3<sup>16</sup>. But these strictures must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the book is well fitted to be of real value to the educated Christian layman, especially to the layman who fears that modern research has done something to invalidate or ‘demolish’ the Bible as the Word of God. He deals with vital things, such as, ‘Why did Christ die?’ ‘The Evidence for the Resurrection,’ ‘Can we trust the Gospels?’; and the constructive tone of his book, which makes throughout for Christian edification, is happily indicated by his opening and closing chapters, which deal respectively with ‘The Return of Science to God,’ and ‘What does it mean to be a Christian?’

## A NEW MANUAL OF ETHICS.

Professor Wilbur Marshall Urban of Dartmouth College has written an introductory text-book of moral philosophy under the title *Fundamentals of Ethics* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The author is well known for his able and thoughtful works on ‘Valuation’ and ‘The Intelligible World,’ but, if we mistake not, this will prove his most attractive work. Comparable in the nature and scope of its discussions to the manuals by J. G. Mackenzie and Dewey and Tufts, it enters into a not-overcrowded field; and it will commend itself to many teachers and students not only by the clarity, intelligibility, and freshness of its contents, but also by the fact that it dispenses with anything like elaborate treatment of the psychological and anthropological aspects of ethics, being more concerned to bring out the relations of ethics to economics and law.

The first part of the work deals with Moral Theory, and Professor Urban enlists the interest of the reader at the outset by raising the whole subject under concrete instances of moral problems, in particular the famous case of the Bollenger baby. Perhaps we meet with this case too often in the sequel, but it serves the author’s purpose well of leading us to the distinction between the formalist and the teleological theories, and to the distinction within the teleological theory between hedonism and perfectionism (or the ethics of self-realization). It is the last-named type of ethical theory which is endorsed by Professor Urban.

In the second and largest part, which treats of Moral Practice, emphasis is laid upon the ideas of rights, justice, and duty, and guidance offered upon vexed questions of our economic and social life. Rather than attempt a comprehensive survey of our social institutions, Professor Urban has deemed it wise to concentrate upon the basal institutions of Property and the Family. He defends the permanent monogamous form of the Family against its present-day detractors, and shows himself in true sympathy with the Christian ideal of marriage.

The third and concluding part, entitled Moral Philosophy, leads us to the more fundamental philosophical problems belonging to ethics, such as those of freedom and progress and the relation between morals and religion. On this last subject we could have wished a fuller and more adequate treatment from Professor Urban’s pen, especially as he believes in the logical interdependence of morality and religion, and subscribes to the moral argument for the existence of God.

Two features of this useful and attractive text-book may be named in conclusion: its classified bibliographical lists at the close of each chapter, and its numerous illustrations from contemporary life and general literature.

### PESSIMISM.

Dr. Radoslav A. Tsanoff, Professor of Philosophy in the Rice Institute, has written an interesting book entitled *The Nature of Evil* (Macmillan; 15s. net). But the title is misleading. It is true that we shall not consult his pages in vain for a statement of the theory of evil held, say, by St. Augustine or Leibniz or Hegel. It is also true that he expounds at the end of his book what he calls 'a gradational view of evil' (the essence of which is that evil is a 'degradation'). But the question of the nature of evil is really subsidiary in his book to the historical exposition of Pessimism. The book might have been entitled 'Pessimism' or 'Pessimism and Theodicy'; and it should be observed that it does not confine itself to the strict field of technical philosophy, but crosses into the domains of religion and literature.

First comes a rapid sketch of the problem of evil in the great religions, Indian, Greek, Persian, and Jewish; then a survey of the problem of evil in ancient and mediæval thought. Pascal's despair of reason is then expounded, and next the scepticism of Bayle and the theodicy of Leibniz, the eighteenth-century optimism, and the despair of civilization of Voltaire, Rousseau, and Tolstoy. A chapter is devoted to the Devil in modern poetry, another to Leopardi's and another to Alfred de Vigny's pessimism. After that there follow chapters on Schopenhauer, Hartmann, and the German pessimists generally.

Obviously Dr. Tsanoff has given himself the chance of writing about interesting personalities; and he has seized it with both hands. He confesses, indeed, in his chapter on the Devil that the conception of supreme evil has been selected by him as a window through which we may look into the inner life and into the view of life of several modern poets. His own standpoint is theistic. His book contains much eloquent writing.

In *The Religion of Masonry* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net) the Rev. J. Fort Newton, D.D., gives us a reverent and sympathetic but wholly uncritical account of the religious teaching of Free Masonry

as he understands it. He points out that there are three distinct types of Masonry, the English-American which is simply theistic, the German which is more definitely Christian, and the Latin which is frankly agnostic. Dr. Fort Newton belongs to the first type. He has much that is admirable to say about the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but it is surprising, to say the least, how a Christian minister can so completely ignore the most distinctive tenets of the Christian faith, and look forward with enthusiasm to the coming of one 'universal creed of fundamental religion' which is found alike in 'the Gospel of the Christian, the Book of Law of the Hebrew, the Koran of the Mussulman, or the Vedas of the Hindu.' Nor is it easy to understand how he fails to see that an esoteric doctrine and ritual from which one-half of humanity is excluded, and whose mysteries 'no one is permitted to describe,' cannot possibly be reconciled with that gospel which St. Paul preached, 'warning everyman and teaching everyman in all wisdom, that we may present everyman perfect in Christ Jesus.' Frankly, Dr. Fort Newton writes in this book not as a Christian in the New Testament sense of the term, but as an ardent theosophist.

The 'talks' that are delivered to us over the wireless are generally well worth listening to, and sometimes worthy of a more permanent form. Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson gave a series on *Plato and his Dialogues*, and they are now issued, considerably enlarged we should think, as a book (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net). No more delightful introduction to the easy study of Plato could be desired. We have a necessary chapter on the Historic Background, another on Socrates, and chapters on The Republic, The Laws, and on 'Love and Philosophy.' The exposition and commentary are both suitable for the plain man, and one of the good features of the book is the generous scale of the quotations from Plato himself. Mr. Dickinson's enthusiasm leads him into some incautious generalizations, such as this: 'There has never been an age so like our own as the age of ancient Greece.' But Dr. Glover says the same of the age immediately after Christ. And others would say the same of other periods. That is a small matter, however, and this book can be heartily commended to those who, without Greek, wish to know what a great thinker like Plato thought of life and destiny.

To our readers who are interested in the by-ways in literary criticism we warmly recommend a series



of papers written by Mr. W. Rose, Reader in German in London University, which appears under the title of *Men, Myths and Movements in German Literature* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). The subjects include the Mediæval Beast Epic, the Historical Doctor Faustus and the Folk-Book, the Historical Background of Goethe's *Werther*, Goethe and the Jews, the German Drama, 1914-1927, etc. Every paper is interesting, and nearly all are the fruit of careful research in fields but little explored.

The late Archdeacon Charles selected twenty-two 'practical sermons' for publication. They now appear with the title *Courage, Truth, Purity* (Blackwell; 6s. net). They were all preached to that audience of thoughtful people who crowded the Abbey to hear him. Among the subjects are Christ's Bequest of Peace, The Soul's Cry for Salvation, The Soul's Loneliness, and the Atrophy of Unused Powers. This last address—somewhat shortened—is in 'The Christian Year' this month. The sermons are prefaced by a short memoir by the Archbishop of Armagh, who was a personal friend, and the memoir is written out of full knowledge and affection. He pays a suitable tribute to Dr. Charles's great apocalyptic work.

One of the most interesting problems of our time is to work out the bearing of the new physics upon philosophic thought. *Prolegomena to a New Metaphysic*, by Mr. Thomas Whittaker (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net), is a profoundly able contribution to this subject. In the opening chapter the author deals faithfully with the pragmatists, maintaining that 'there is, both in science and philosophy, ascertained theoretic truth.' Thereafter he proceeds towards the construction of an ontology on the basis of the new view of the world given by the physicists, particularly Sir James Jeans in 'The Mysterious Universe.' The hypothesis advanced is 'that metaphysical beings, hitherto latent, find the way to manifest themselves when the real processes correlated with physical change have made phenomena possible that could not be produced earlier.' This at once suggests Leibniz, but certain criticisms directed against his windowless monads are met. The whole treatment of the subject is in the highest degree careful and scholarly, and will repay close study.

It is friendly of Flora Masson to give us from her store of Victorian reminiscences *Victorians All* (Chambers; 3s. 6d. net) in ten delightful chapters, which take us from the Orme's house in Avenue

Road to the Masson's in Edinburgh, then back to London, where many days were spent with Florence Nightingale. We are brought into touch with the Victorians in a manner that enriches us, whether it be Herbert Spencer picnicking under the Hampstead pines, or Coventry Patmore's 'Angel in the House' waving farewell across the shadowy heath, or Carlyle singing 'Stuart Mill on Mind and Matter' to the tune of 'Roy's Wife of Aldivalloch.'

There is a grateful memory of Canon Ainger—that man of so many imperishable memories—giving out as his text in the Temple Church on a hot August Sunday: 'Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place.'

An interesting survey of the career of one of the most attractive Victorian personalities is furnished in *Matthew Arnold: A Critic of the Victorian Period*, by Mr. Charles H. Harvey (James Clarke; 6s. net). The book begins with a sketch of Arnold's life, and proceeds to expound his work as a poet, an educationist, a critic, and a theologian. This bare summary reminds us of Arnold's many-sidedness. He was a genuine (if minor) poet; he did really good work as an inspector of schools; and his religious writings are the work of one who had a very real concern about spiritual things. It was as a critic, however, and particularly a critic of the era that produced him, that he did his most serious work. His religious musings were not constructive; they were for the most part destructive, and his contribution in this sphere (contrary to Mr. Harvey's opinion) is of little permanent significance. But he was always, and in every region, interesting, and this essay will serve perhaps as an introduction (if read with caution) for any one who wishes to know something about what he was and did.

The contention of Mr. J. Llewellyn Thomas's book, *Israel and the Church* (Covenant Publishing Company; 2s. 6d. net), is, briefly, that 'there has been no displacement of Israel in favour of any Church or Gentile peoples' (p. 81). 'On the contrary, the continuance of the Israel Church and People is assured, with the addition to their Church of all Gentiles, who would enter it through faith in the Messiah of Israel' (p. 24). This thesis is worked out in ways which will scarcely appeal to an historical student of the Bible or to a supporter of what Mr. Thomas calls 'Destructive Higher Criticism.'

Dr. Hay Fleming in a foreword to *Roman Dogma*

and *Scripture Truth*, by the Rev. Alexander Stewart, D.D. (W. F. Henderson, Edinburgh; 3s. 6d. net), says: 'Seldom have I read any course of lectures with so much pleasure and genuine satisfaction.' This testimony of so eminent an authority ought to secure many readers for the book. And they will not be disappointed, for it is thoroughly reliable on questions of fact, and scrupulously fair in tone, besides being eminently readable. It contains ten lectures delivered in 1930-31 under the auspices of the Protestant Institute of Scotland, and these lectures deal with all the great dogmas of the Roman Church. It is a work of real ability, thoroughly up to date and most timely.

It must be confessed that worthily to review *Religious Behaviour: An Introduction to the Psychological Study of Religion*, by Mr. David M. Trout, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology in Hillsdale College (Macmillan; 20s. net), would require a syndicate, partly because a syndicate has created it, and partly because its proper use can only be achieved by a syndicate. For almost ten years the author and his students have been working to produce the book, and it therefore represents not only the mind of one man on the subject, but a method of studying it which is the professor's own. Each chapter is preceded by a page of questions which have to be discussed and answered (if you can) before the chapter is read. The chapter itself leads to further co-operative study. Problems emerge for individual pursuit, and literature is indicated that will help. The headings of chapters are Varieties of Religious Behaviour, Religion as Organismic Behaviour, Religious Goals, Religious Mediation, The Persistence of Religious Behaviour, and others. The writer has a high opinion of the book himself, and in this he is thoroughly justified, for it exhibits the results of enormous labour and deep and earnest thinking. There are seventeen pages of 'selected' literature that has been consulted, and the problems submitted for our discussion display an amazing intellectual fertility. The author has not made things easy for the reader. This is no book for the dilettante. It has been written for the serious student, and the serious student will find plenty here into which to get his teeth. And when Dr. Trout finds the serious student, he compliments him by a treatment of great questions that is suggestive rather than dogmatic.

Professor Henry K. Rowe, Ph.D., of the Andover-Newton Theological School, has produced an admirable work in *History of the Christian People*

(Macmillan; 20s. net). We regret that the price, owing no doubt to the fall in sterling, makes the book inaccessible to students of Church History, who would benefit most from its use. It is a scholarly account of the main movements in the history of Christianity from the beginning to the present day, and is exceedingly well done. Each chapter has appended a comprehensive and well-selected bibliography, and a series of questions suitable for discussion.

*The Church or the World*, by the Rev. C. W. Hale Amos, D.D. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 6s. net), is a book which speaks with no uncertain sound. The author stresses to the utmost the opposition between the spirit of Christ and the Spirit of the world. In Part I. he analyses the sources and manifestations of the world-spirit, and in Part II. he sketches 'the enterprise of the Church,' showing how the battle for evangelical truth and purity has been waged throughout the Christian ages. The book, if somewhat diffuse and perhaps narrow, is full of sound Christian teaching, and is to be welcomed as being in many respects a wholesome corrective to the amiable religiosity of our time.

*Realizing Religion*, by Mr. S. M. Shoemaker (Nisbet; 3s. 6d. net), is warmly commended in a foreword by the Rev. James Reid, as an admirable guide 'into the true freedom and joy of the Christian experience.' A friend of the writer's, 'a very modern person,' passed through a striking religious change, the stages of which were 'a superb and conquering self-assurance, melting under a growing spiritual aspiration into conscious inadequacy, the increasing sense of sin, and later, a deep hunger for re-birth, the actual discovery of Christ in conversion, and the search for means to keep this experience alive.' The presentation of Christian truth which led to this change is here set down in the hope that it may prove helpful to others. The various chapters contain much wise Christian teaching in regard to the soul's need of redemption from sin and the power of the living Christ to meet that need and to give fullness of life and joy.

*Our Father*, by the Rt. Rev. A. A. David, D.D., Bishop of Liverpool (Nisbet; 2s. 6d. net), is an attempt to co-ordinate the conceptions of God suggested by modern science with the revelation of God in Christ. 'May it not be that the present generation with its rich inheritance of our new learning, its growing experience of closer contacts, and its wider knowledge of the world of men, is



called to take another step in the agelong process of magnifying God?' With the enlargement of knowledge the boundary of encircling mystery grows, so that with every new discovery there comes a fresh call to adoration, prayer, and worship. This little book is full of strong Christian thinking, and should be most helpful to many who feel themselves tossed to and fro on the changeful tides of modern thought.

The main thesis of *The Pilgrim Church*, by Mr. E. H. Broadbent (Pickering & Inglis; 7s. 6d. net), is that the true Church never becomes an institution; is constituted whenever two or three resolve in fellowship to follow only the New Testament; and has always existed not in the Catholic Church, but among Novatianists, Paulicians, Bogomils, and others despised as schismatics, down to the present day.

An immense amount of trouble has been taken by the Rev. Wilbur M. Smith in compiling *A List of Bibliographies of Theological and Biblical Literature published in Great Britain and America, 1595-1931*. The list, which we have found to be reliable wherever we were able to test it, does not include bibliographies of Church History nor denominational bibliographies 'which are primarily concerned with listing historical material relating to a particular denomination.' Brief biographical items that follow the authors' names add considerably to the interest of the book, which can be had for one dollar from the author, Presbyterian Church, Coatesville, Pa., U.S.A.

Preachers who neglect the Minor Prophets are robbing themselves and their congregations of much that is of the utmost value for the life of to-day. This has again been demonstrated by the excellent little book of Dr. Charles Venn Pilcher on *Three Hebrew Prophets and the Passing of the Empires* (R.T.S.; 6s. net). The prophets in question are Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah—a better idea of the chronological development would have been given had he put Zephaniah first. Dr. Pilcher leans heavily—and admittedly—on Sellin, but there is no harm in that, for Sellin is inclined to be, in some directions, less radical than many scholars, and more interested in the religious aspect of exegesis. Two features mark this commentary: (i) the clearness with which the historical background is sketched. There is a good account, in brief, of the Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian Empires—Assyria with its militarism and Babylon

with its culture—and he even contrives to speak a good word for Assyria. And (ii) the commentary is written to illustrate 'the agony, the futility, and the irrationality of war.' Any one who can drive that home to-day is rendering a public service; and Dr. Pilcher vividly shows how the prophets he deals with drove it home upon the conscience of their own generation. The vividness is enhanced by the setting to which the writer assigns it—Nahum is a Thanksgiving service for the Fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C., and Habakkuk about 590, is a Service of Intercession. The commentary proper is well done.

Mr. Charles Boutflower, M.A., well known from his previous studies in Daniel and Isaiah, challenges the philological argument which would assign Daniel to a late date on the strength of the fact that the *z* of the older Aramaic inscriptions appears as *d* in Daniel. The writer contends that the presence of the sibilant or the dental is no indication of age, but of geographical position; there were, he argues, two Aramaic dialects—the western, which was sibilant, and the eastern, or pure Aramaic (in which *Dn* was written), which was dental. The title of the book, *Dadda-Idri; or, The Aramaic of the Book of Daniel* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net), significantly indicates the starting-point from which the argument develops; for 'Dadda-Idri' is the Assyrian transcription, in the ninth century B.C., of the name known to the Old Testament as Hadadezer: which shows, Mr. Boutflower contends, that in Damascus, at any rate, the sound heard was *d*, not *z*. The old inscriptions which give *z* come from the north-west border of Aramaica. The book, whose argument involves an excursion into the Elephantine papyri, Ethiopic, Sabeian, etc., is written in defence of the view that 'the dialect of the Book of Daniel, though it tells us nothing as to the date of that Book, is seen to be no longer a bar to its having been written by the prophet himself.'

Books on the Lord's Prayer are very numerous, and any addition to them would need some special merit to justify it. So far as we can see there does not seem to be any such pressing need to be found in *The Revelation of God in the Lord's Prayer*, by Mr. Donald M. D. Stuart, F.G.S. (Stockwell; 7s. 6d. net). It is an earnest exposition, without much originality or freshness, and will commend itself to those who seek for their devotional reading an exposition of undoubted piety and sincerity.

*The Great Amphibium*, by Mr. Joseph Needham

(S.C.M.; 6s. net), contains, as indicated in the subtitle, 'four lectures on the position of religion in a world dominated by science.' The somewhat puzzling title of the book is derived from a sentence of Sir Thomas Browne, 'Thus is man that great and true Amphibium, whose nature is disposed to live, not only like other creatures in diverse elements, but in divided and distinguished worlds.' These lectures are manifestly the work of a strong and independent thinker, who expresses himself with great force and clearness, though at times he is somewhat elusive and hard to follow. He has little faith in any easy reconciliation of religion and science. The interest in religion which has marked the opening years of the present century he believes to be 'a wholly temporary and minor phenomenon.' Two sentences may help to indicate his point of view. 'The scientific worker no longer believes that if we knew enough about the physical world we could predict the movements of individual particles; he considers rather the odds on their movements, and admits the unavoidable escape of everything individual and unique through the meshes of his net.' 'When religion thinks at all, it puts all its emphasis on individual things, unique things, incalculable and spontaneous things, qualitative entities having no exact counterpart anywhere in the universe. It is thus wiser than science, and akin to history.'

Within a year of the publication of the first volume, Dr. W. Tudor Jones has issued volume ii. of *Contemporary Thought of Germany* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net), thus completing the work. The two volumes, packed as they are on every page, are none too much for the treatment of so vast and complicated a subject. Dr. Jones has had to do much pioneering, for this is the first attempt made on such a scale to interpret the various domains of thought in Germany during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In this second volume, after an introductory chapter on the orientation and main meanings of the various currents of thought, he gives an account of the various forms of Transcendentalism, Phenomenology, Sociology, the Philosophy of Life, and the Philosophy of Religion, Catholic and Protestant. The whole work is a marvel of industry and erudition, in which the writer shows extraordinarily wide acquaintance with present-day leaders of thought in Germany. The number of names treated is perhaps embarrassingly large, as may be

judged from the fact that so influential a thinker as Karl Barth is dismissed in three lines. The book is in some respects a kind of philosophic Who's Who, more suitable for reference than for general reading. None the less it will be of the greatest value for giving the student of German thought the right perspective.

*The Four Gospels in the Light of To-day*, by Edith Ratcliffe (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net), is written in an exceedingly clear and straightforward way. It gives with much freshness a popular account of what modern scholarship finds in the Synoptic Gospels and in John. In the main the writer follows the critical findings of Canon Streeter, with a distinct tendency towards a conservative position. Beyond this there is little ability to plumb the depths or to realize that here we are face to face with a *mysterium tremendum*. The sterner elements in the Gospel are simply set aside as being out of harmony with our enlightened age, and a portrait is sketched of a Jesus who is, above everything else, amiable and nice. His life, we are told, 'was full also of fun and gaiety, and jokes, and good-natured banter,' and we are given to understand that even His denunciations of the Pharisees were uttered with a twinkle in His eye. In this type of portrait, much as it may appeal to the sentimentality of our time, it is difficult to recognize the Jesus of the Gospels and the Christ of the Church's faith.

It has often been a puzzle why Denmark is so far ahead of this country in its co-operative farming, and perhaps the reason is to be found in the practical and intelligent development of its higher education. Miss Nøelle Davies, M.A., Ph.D., has sketched for us the life and labours of the great pioneer of this movement in *Education for Life*, a Danish Pioneer (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net). This pioneer was N. F. S. Grundtvig, and in a series of chapters his biographer shows us both the ideals and achievements of the man who founded the Danish High Schools. How 'modern' he was may be judged from the fact that he abominated examinations, and would have none of them, and that for him universities were meant not for lecturing but for stimulating by discussion and other means the interpretation of life. We have not yet reached this standard over here, but the story of this remarkable man's career may help us on the way.



# National Contributions to Biblical Science.

## XV. The Contribution of Great Britain to Church History.

BY PROFESSOR W. D. NIVEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

### II.

#### ENGLAND.

We pass to works dealing with the Church History of Britain itself, leaving aside the numerous books which deal with the Church in individual countries outside our island, on the ground that few if any of them can be assigned any independent value.

(a) *The Church of England*.—Of the older works which deal with long periods we mention Thomas Fuller's *Church History of Britain from the Birth of Christ to the Year 1648* (1655), not because it has any great historical value, but as a tribute to the memory of an eccentric scholar whose pages are so lively, abounding with 'quaint conceits.' More valuable is his *Worthies of England*, which contains a mass of solid information along with a profusion of biographical anecdote. More respectable as real history is Jeremy Collier's *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*, 2 vols. (1708–14), of which a re-issue in nine volumes was made in 1852. This work was the product of many years' labour, and exhibits great ability, although it is strongly tinctured with his non-juring views. Out of many popular works of recent times, the general standard of which is high, may be mentioned Dean Spence's *Church of England: A History for the People*, 4 vols. (1898). Thoroughly popular in presentation, it is based on real scholarship.

A useful book is H. O. Wakeman's *Introduction to the History of the Church of England* (1896). We have here the work of a scientific historian dealing with the main epochs. The author's own ecclesiastical views colour his treatment of the Reformation and the Oxford Movement, but not sufficiently so to impair the real value.

Of greater worth is Canon Perry's *History of the Church of England from the Death of Elizabeth*, 3 vols. (1862–64), full but not overloaded, always clear and based on exhaustive study. Readable and reliable, though not attaining to the stature of Perry's work, is A. Plummer's *English Church History*, 3 vols. (1900–7), which deals with the period from the death of Henry VII. to the death of

William III. The standard work is the series edited by Stephens and Hunt, 7 vols. (1899–1904). It is not possible to write the history of one's own Church in an absolutely impartial temper, and the various writers here do not conceal that they belong to the High Church School. Yet an honest attempt has been made to tell the story without prejudice, and a creditable measure of success has been attained. In a series by different hands it is difficult to attain uniformity of excellence and some of these volumes are better than others, but the general standard is very high, and the lapses are not pronounced. No pains have been spared to secure accuracy and completeness of statement, and the result is a work of which the Church of England may with reason be proud, and with which she may be satisfied. When we in Scotland consider the sad state of our ecclesiastical histories, we may look across the Border with wistfulness, deriving what comfort we may from the consideration that in contrast to our ecclesiastical affairs the course of events in England has, except for three excitements, been placid and plain.

We now consider works dealing specifically with definite periods. A good book dealing with the most ancient times is J. Pryce's *Ancient British Church* (1878), but it is far from being adequate in the light of more recent study of the Celtic Church. The best treatment of the British Church lies in H. Williams's article in Hastings' *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*, vol. iii.

In histories of the early English Church place of honour is due to 'the father of English Church History,' the Venerable Bede. Bede for his time was singularly well aware of what the writing of history required in the way of evaluating testimony. He is not a romancer or purveyor of mere legends and reported miracles. His work is almost astonishingly free of the miraculous. He is a sober and judicious writer who usually may be quoted as authoritative without hesitation. Among modern works *The Mission of St. Augustine to England according to Original Documents* (1897), edited by Canon Mason, is a valuable collection of sources, all the original passages bearing on Augustine's mission being adduced

and translated, and this supplemented by Essays on relevant topics. *The Beginnings of English Christianity*, by W. E. Collins (1898), which deals specially with the mission of Augustine, is of value.

On the Medieval Period there are two notable books on the age of Wycliffe. J. Gairdner's *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, 2 vols. (1908), is based on study of the original documents and is of great value for its depicting of the political and religious life of the time. The author himself sympathizes with the repressive side, but his treatment is very able and the information he gives most illuminating. G. M. Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe* (1899) is a thorough and impartial study by a scientific historian. Dealing with a more extensive field we have a good *History of the Church of England, the Pre-Reformation Period*, by T. P. Boulton (1879).

Coming to the Reformation Period, among works which serve to some extent as sources there are J. Strype's *Memorials* (1709) and J. Lewis's *Reformation Settlement* (1885). Strype is extraordinarily dry, but his memorias of leading figures of the time of Henry VIII. and Mary are valuable. His very lack of originality is pledge of his faithful transmission of trustworthy information, and his information is exceptionally detailed and veracious. Lewis gives an invaluable summary of Acts and official documents, 1509-1666.

Bishop Burnet's *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 7 vols. (1681-1715), may justifiably be called a standard history. It is marked by accuracy and real grasp of what is important. It had the unique merit of securing for its author a vote of thanks from both Houses of Parliament, and its long popularity is evidenced by the need of a fresh edition being felt so late as 1865. Canon Dixon's *History of the Church of England from the Abolition of the Romish Jurisdiction*, 6 vols. (1878-91), covers 1529-70. It is a learned but over-elaborated work which becomes tedious. The volume on the time of Mary is specially valuable. J. H. Blunt's *Reformation of the Church of England*, 2 vols. (1869-82), is sound, and H. N. Birt's *Elizabethan Religious Settlement* (1907) is useful as a study of contemporary documents and for its judicious estimate of earlier historians. Although the author is a Roman Catholic, there is nothing controversial in his treatment. The *Marprelate Controversy* (1588-90) is very ably investigated by W. M. Pierce in his *Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts* (1909).

On the period since the Reformation, J. Stoughton's *History of Religion in England*, 6 vols.

(1867-78), deals with the period from the Civil Wars to the Georgian Age. It aims at doing justice to both the Church of England and the Non-conformists, the first and almost the only enterprise of the kind. It gives the history of both, and shows their interactions. W. A. Shaw's *History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth*, 2 vols. (1900), is valuable for the view it gives of the attempt to establish Presbyterianism in England and its collapse. On the Non-Jurors may be added T. Lathbury's *History of the Non-Jurors* (1843), and a very scholarly work, *The Later Non-Jurors*, by H. Broxap (1924).

On the Oxford Movement we have biographical studies rather than historical narratives of much value, though we have an all too brief sketch in Canon Overton's *Anglican Revival*, the value of which bears no relation to its size. The standard work is Dean Church's *Oxford Movement* (1891). It is scarcely a history, though it contains the materials for a history.

(b) *The Nonconformists*.—Among works which deal generally with Nonconformity and Dissent in England, and are of genuine value, we have F. Bate's *The Declaration of Indulgence, 1672: A Study in the Rise of Organised Dissent* (1908); H. S. Skeats and C. S. Miall's *History of the Free Churches of England, (1688-1891)*; and the standard work, *The History of the Dissenters*, 4 vols. (1908-12), by D. Bogue and J. Bennett.

On the Baptists a very readable and learned work is T. Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, 4 vols. (1738-40). It deals with the period from the Reformation to George I. Among more recent books, *A History of British Baptists*, by W. T. Whitley (1923), is noteworthy as a competent and scholarly work.

On the Independents the standard history is J. Waddington's *Congregational History*, 5 vols. (1869-80), but R. W. Dale's single-volume *History of English Congregationalism* (1907) gives an adequate account.

On Methodism a work of outstanding merit is *A New History of Methodism*, 2 vols. (1909). Twenty-six writers contribute to it, and the whole is a comprehensive and trustworthy work. W. C. Holden's *Brief History of Methodism and Methodist Missions* (1877) is worth notice.

Quaker writers have in recent years given most scholarly account of themselves. From W. C. Braithwaite we have *The Beginnings of Quakerism*, (1912), and *The Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), and from H. M. Jones *The Later Periods of Quakerism*,



2 vols. (1921)—all four volumes maintaining a very high standard of excellence.

On Puritanism we have *The History of the Early and of the Later Puritans*, by J. B. Marsden, 2 vols. (1850-52); and provision of sources in Frere and Douglas's *Puritan Manifestoes* (1907), and P. Bayne's *Documents relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity* (1862). The most scholarly work which has been produced in recent times is *Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution*, by C. E. Whiting (1931).

#### SCOTLAND.

Scotland's ecclesiastical history has been so remarkable that it is almost incredible that there is not in existence a complete and completely satisfying account of it. Yet so it is. To understand this, various considerations must be kept in mind. Scotland was late in becoming a land of culture. Though some excellent schools existed in the Middle Ages, and great advance was made in the fifteenth century, it was only at the Reformation that the Scottish people generally emerged from an almost barbarian illiteracy and began to deserve their renown as well-educated. Of certain periods few contemporary records exist. There is grave reason to suspect that some records have been falsified, and we know that records which once existed have disappeared, many through carelessness and some probably by deliberate destruction. In consequence, the history at points must be a work of reconstruction, and such is not always universally acceptable. Again, Scotland has been very unlike England, which Dean Stanley held to be almost ideal as a scene for writing sober history. The dominant Scottish Church has not been, like her Anglican sister, a spacious home of tolerance for the most diverse views; nor has she had so continuously since the Reformation, as the Anglican Church has had, a considerable body outside her own pale among whom views opposed to the dominant view might develop. In consequence, there arose in Scotland a traditional orthodox view of the course of events and the judgment to be passed on them, a tradition which even to-day is fairly strong, and some writers have yielded to the temptation to avoid giving offence to their public. Nor has Scotland enjoyed what England may be proud of—facilities of cloistered calm to afford to scholars who out of the din of conflict might devote themselves to the pursuit of historical knowledge for its own sake. Much of our national ecclesiastical history has been written in

a very heated atmosphere by men who were in the forefront of ecclesiastical strife, with the inevitable result that much that passed for history has been distorted by prejudice and is deficient in breadth of view and sobriety of judgment. In such considerations largely lies the explanation of the curious fact that no Scottish scholar has written an ecclesiastical history of Scotland which will stand comparison with the work of the Scottish scholars Lindsay and Mackinnon on the German Reformation. MacEwen might have done it had he been spared to finish and revise his notable work, but the sad truth is that nobody has done it with the strictly or mainly ecclesiastical interest in view. We have some half-dozen standard Histories of Scotland, and the civil history cannot be written without incorporating the main elements of the ecclesiastical. Best of them is Hume Brown's *History of Scotland to 1843*, 3 vols. (1909-12), but Tytler, Hill Burton, Lang, and Rait are all worth consulting. But none of these professes to write as a Church historian, and a complete history of the Church they do not write.

Of works covering the whole or a considerable period there are only three that merit consideration, by Grub, Cunningham, and MacEwen respectively. W. Stephen's rather pretentious *History of the Scottish Church*, 2 vols. (1894-96), is only a compilation; *The Church of Scotland, Past and Present*, edited by Story (1890-91), three volumes of which by different writers are on the history, is not only a mere compilation but an incoherent one; while J. Macpherson's *History of the Church in Scotland* (1901) is quite unoriginal, ill-balanced, and singularly dull. G. Grub's *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, 4 vols. (1861), covers the whole period down to his own day, and for the time at which it was written is a praiseworthy performance, fully abreast of the knowledge accessible, and exhibiting the true historical spirit. For an Episcopalian it was natural and pardonable to lose proportion a little in dealing with his own Church in Scotland; what is pleasing is his general accuracy of statement and sound judgment in his treatment of the Presbyterian Church.

J. Cunningham's *Church History of Scotland*, 2 vols. (1859), is also a creditable work for the time. Denominational predilection, not to say prejudice, becomes a little marked as his narrative approaches his own time. That is not surprising. The embers of the fierce controversy which disrupted the Church were still very hot. On the whole the work merited the wide welcome which it received. What is very disappointing is that a second edition in 1883 is

practically a reprint of the first, ignoring the mass of fuller knowledge that had become accessible in the interval on both the Celtic and the Medieval Church. But *felix culpa*! if Cunningham's failure were a factor in stimulating MacEwen to supply his omissions. A. R. MacEwen's *A History of the Church in Scotland*, 2 vols. (1913-1918), stands alone on a solitary peak of excellence. It is a history in a sense in which no previous work was history, and no considerable work has yet appeared in the same field to rival it. He had a large amount of new material available which he used with sound judgment and scholarly discrimination. We can only deplore that death prevented the extension of his labours beyond the Reformation. His excellent little book on *The Erskines* (1900) is sufficient to enable us to realize how great is our loss. This is not the only element of tragedy which invests his work. The book is now exceedingly difficult to procure. Further, the section dealing with the Celtic Church is far behind the results of newer study. So rapidly was investigation proceeding that his work was out of date soon after it was done. This part really cannot be amended, it needs to be done over again. It is not meant that MacEwen's views are all wrong, there is much in this section that can stand, but important changes need to be made in many particulars. To that we shall return. It will become manifest in our consideration of the work done on the subject of the Celtic Church to which we now pass.

Although, and perhaps because, authentic sources for a history of the Celtic Church are so very few, a great literature on that Church has appeared. Probably in no field has the diverting game of making bricks without straw been more assiduously played. For the space of fully four centuries we know that Christianity maintained some kind of existence in Scotland, but the number of authentic details about it is very scanty. Our sources are limited to a few lives of Celtic missionaries, a few disjointed statements in ancient chronicles, a few scattered references in ancient writers. As to the first, many of them were written long after the death of their heroes, and they must be used with great discrimination. A history of the Celtic Church can therefore be only an attempted reconstruction on that rather slender foundation, and will depend on the interpretation given to statements which not seldom admit of more than one interpretation. The reconstruction came, and by one writer simply copying from and expanding freely his predecessors, a traditional orthodox view established itself. The main particulars of this prevalent conception

were that the ancient Church in Scotland was keenly opposed to Rome and was indeed not unlike a Presbyterian Church, that it was free of many at least of the corruptions which Rome admitted, and that the Scottish people were rightly reluctant to accept the Roman Church which was forced upon them by royal power, and rejoiced in the Reformation which meant a return to the principles of the Culdee Church. Such a reconstruction of the character of the Celtic Church was widely accepted, and with more or less elaboration is set forth in numerous histories. As soon as this imposing edifice was critically examined as to its foundations by men who deserved the name of scholar, and knew what the writing of sober history implied, it fell in ruin. It was very clear that the differences between the Celtic and the Roman Churches were matters only of a few usages and organization, and that ecclesiastics who cling tenaciously to one form of tonsure and one reckoning of Easter are not obviously superior to others who as tenaciously advocate another. That the Celtic Church had peculiarities due not to independence of or opposition to the Continental Church but to its geographical isolation is admitted by historians such as Skene, *Celtic Scotland*, ii. (1887); Dowden, *The Celtic Church in Scotland* (1894). The question as to how far it was opposed to the hierarchical system crowned by the absolute authority of the Pope is more difficult. Even MacEwen on this point may not unfairly be charged with arguing from negatives. We are still searching for terms which will not be misleading in a definition of the relationship of the two Churches. *Opposition* is false, *independence* is inapplicable and risky, but there is more reality in the difference than Roman Catholic writers allow, though J. C. McNaught in his recent study, *The Celtic Church and the See of Peter* (1927), practically agrees with their position.

The second reconstruction that became traditional was one of the course of events. It ran like this. While Ninian evangelized the south and Kentigern revived his work, the fruits of their labours were transient. Christianity effectively gripped the country only under Columba, whose labours were almost country-wide and who in the north was a pioneer. Whithorn had sunk to insignificance as a centre of evangelization, Kentigern left no successors in Glasgow, everything depended on Iona. That view is still commonly held. It is the view held by MacEwen. Since he wrote, fresh study has produced such results as make the traditional view untenable. Celtic philology has so advanced that with assurance scholars can distinguish Pictish from Scottish



names. The Picts have now come into far clearer view. Such records as we possess have undergone fresh scrutiny, and the question has been raised, Is the familiar representation of Columba's activity credible? Could he have been the evangelist of a people whose language was so different that, as we are told, he required an interpreter when he visited them, and who were bitterly hostile on political grounds? As a result we have in A. B. Scott's *The Pictish Nation, its People and Church* (1918), and Douglas Simpson's *The Historical Saint Columba* (1927; revised edition same year), a revolutionary reconstruction. The main points are that we have to think of two Churches which coalesced only after long independent existence—the Brito-Pictish with centres at Whithorn and Glasgow, and the Scottic centred in Iona—that the extent of Columba's work has been much exaggerated, that it was Bangor, Whithorn, and Glasgow, not Iona, that evangelized most of the Picts. It will not be surprising if further study show that Scott and Simpson have in some points overstated their case, but one is convinced that they have made out a real case. Their view is more credible than the old one, which ignores philology and archæology and the political tension between Picts and Scots.

On the period from Queen Margaret to the Reformation the works of Bishop Dowden, *The Bishops of Scotland* and *The Medieval Church in Scotland*, are almost impeccable in accuracy.

Since the Reformation there has been an unbroken stream of narratives by men who were eye-witnesses of the events they relate. As indicated, their judgment is often prejudiced and their selection of facts determined by propagandist or polemical aims. Yet there is such an abundance of material that patient study will succeed in extricating a trustworthy narrative. Of prime importance as sources for the century beginning with the Reformation are the *Histories* of Knox, Calderwood, Spottiswood, and Row, *The Autobiography and Diary of James Melville, 1557-1613*, *The Booke of the Universal Kirk*, Baillie's *Letters and Journals, 1637-62*. Through the activity of The Wodrow Society, the Bannatyne and other Clubs, all the main sources are accessible. Of Knox's work it may be said that it is not merely a source but a history enjoying wide popularity down to recent times. Laing's edition, provided with valuable notes, was issued in 1846-47, and more recent editions with the advantage of modernized spelling have appeared. Despite the criticisms of Andrew Lang, Knox's narrative with few exceptions is as reliable as it is pungent. Of recent works on the Reformation itself Mitchell's

*The Scottish Reformation* (1900), edited and provided with notes by D. Hay Fleming, is a valuable treatment in short compass. Our authority, however, for this period is unquestionably Dr. Hay Fleming, whose *Reformation in Scotland, Causes, Characteristics, Consequences* (1910), is outstanding. He makes clear among many other things that the destruction of church buildings was not blameable on the Reformers, which had been brought out before in a work with the curious title *Bell the Cat; or, Who destroyed the Scottish Abbeys*, by J. Jamieson, 1902. Hume Brown's admirable *John Knox: A Biography*, 2 vols. (1895), amounts to a reliable history of the Reformation.

On the period from the Reformation to the Revolution Settlement we have the old *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland from the Restauration to the Revolution*, by Wodrow, 2 vols. (1721), and the recent work by J. K. Hewison, *The Covenanters: A History of the Church in Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution*, 2 vols. (1908). Wodrow's work has been occasion of literary controversy. Sufficient to say that while diffuse, ill-arranged, and devoid of all literary merit, it is a storehouse of facts which, with very few exceptions, have never been successfully overthrown. It is significant that Bishop Burnet, in his *History of his Own Times*, confirms Wodrow in all essential particulars. Dr. King Hewison's work is one of great merit. In the first edition occurred many errors which were corrected in a second edition. It is an independent bit of work based on very wide knowledge and careful research. On the Covenanters there are many books, mostly popular narratives, making no pretence to be adequate. Worth mention is J. Lumsden's *The Covenantants of Scotland* (1914) for its revelation of the fact that between 1563 and 1683 there were no fewer than thirty-one covenants, and for its reproduction for the first time of one of them, the Succession Band of 1599.

From 1690 to the present day the story of the Scottish Church has been one of divisions and reunions. These have evoked a large number of popular narratives of very varied excellence. The best account of the Secession is, I venture to say, to be found in MacEwen's *The Erskines* (1900), and of the Disruption, P. Bayne's *The Free Church of Scotland* (1893). On the other side from R. Buchanan's *Ten Years' Conflict* (1849), we have J. Bryce's *Ten Years of the Church of Scotland*, 2 vols. (1850). A very readable and competent book is J. R. Fleming's *The Church in Scotland, 1843-74* (1927). *Two Centuries of the Church of Scotland*,

1707-1929, by A. J. Campbell (1930), gives a very vivid narrative, and shows an honest attempt to exhibit movements in fair perspective. Some judgments, however, both of leaders and movements, have evoked criticism.

The last hundred years, however, may best be studied in the Biographies of the outstanding figures, Chalmers, Rainy, Cairns, and MacEwen, on each of whom works have been written that may rank as histories of their time.

## The Sacrament of Footwashing.

BY PROFESSOR B. W. BACON, D.D., YALE.

AMONG the many surprising reconstructions of Synoptic story effected by our Fourth Evangelist, none is more unaccountable *prima facie* than his rewriting of the narrative of the Farewell Supper. The repast is described, much as in Mark and Matthew, though not identified with the ceremonial Passover banquet, but with the Kiddush or 'consecration' supper on the eve of Passover, as in the authentic text of Lk 22<sup>14-38</sup>. The Designation of the Traitor (Jn 13<sup>2, 10b-11, 21-30</sup>), followed by warnings of desertion on the part of the Twelve and their mission into a hostile world (Lk 22<sup>31-38</sup>; cf. Jn 16<sup>1-33</sup>), shows clearly that the same occasion is meant; but its distinctive feature, the memorial rite of consecrated bread and wine, attested by Paul himself (1 Co 11<sup>23-25</sup>) as kept in unbroken remembrance 'from the Lord,' has disappeared! No institution of the Eucharist is related in the Fourth Gospel, though a discourse in Capernaum, applying the lesson of the Miracle of the Loaves, makes unmistakable reference to it. In Jn 6<sup>51-59</sup> the bread symbolizes the body and blood of the Redeemer, participation in which is essential to eternal life. The anticipation is violent, introducing upon the scene in Galilee utterances impossible to reconcile with the situation described, while the Farewell Supper is shorn of its most vital feature, leaving only a most inadequate substitute, the rite of Footwashing, known to us from 1 Ti 5<sup>10</sup> as practised at Ephesus on certain occasions. This rite our Fourth Evangelist utilizes as an object-lesson for teachings paralleled in Lk 22<sup>24-27</sup>.

It is not at all difficult to understand that an Evangelist who in several instances follows Lukan in preference to Markan tradition should date the Farewell Supper 'before' or, as Heitmüller and Macgregor render Jn 13<sup>1</sup>, 'on the eve of Passover.' The present writer finds no small support among the best qualified critics in his contention that John

and Luke here represent the true line of historical tradition. But it provokes no small astonishment to find the substitution of a different rite as point of attachment for the Farewell Discourses, with consequent complete omission from John of any account of the institution of the Eucharist. It is all the stranger in view of the Evangelist's insistence upon eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man as a *sine qua non* of salvation, and the strangeness is not lessened by the fact that the parable of the Vine (Jn 15<sup>1-8</sup>) and the Prayer for the 'sanctification' of the Church (17<sup>17-19</sup>) would find much better connexion if the preliminary narrative of chapter 13 had related the Kiddush rites of consecration and distribution of wine and bread (*špros*) before the repast. We look in vain for a statement of the institution after 13<sup>1</sup>.

There seems to be no other possible explanation of this strange substitution than the fourth Evangelist's desire to give a new sense to the annual Christian Passover in accordance with his Quarto-deciman dating. For John not only follows the lead of Luke (as against Mark-Matthew) in making the Farewell Supper preparatory only, a 'consecration' leading up to that Redemption feast of the kingdom of God which Jesus will celebrate in heaven. He also intends to bring this preparatory 'consecration' supper into right relation with the 'glorification' of the Son of Man by 'lifting up' on the Cross on the day following. In short, Passover, for John, commemorates Christ's triumph over the 'prince of this world' (Jn 12<sup>31-33</sup>). As Paul, writing from Ephesus to the Corinthians, turns to Christian use the Jewish ceremonies of the eve of Passover, bidding them 'put away the old leaven of malice and wickedness' and thus keep festival, 'because our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ,' so this Ephesian evangelist would celebrate the crucifixion on Nisan 14 as Christ's 'triumph' (Col 2<sup>15</sup>). But he would also



turn to Christian use the rite of the Kiddush, or 'consecration' of Passover of the supper before.

The authentic Luke (omitting the spurious insertion from 1 Co 11<sup>23-25</sup> of vv.<sup>19b-20</sup>) has the same idea of the occasion. This is apparent from the continuation of vv.<sup>15, 16</sup> in vv.<sup>28-30</sup>. The meaning is: 'I have longed to celebrate with you this redemption feast; but my death will prevent. Only as the morrow's banquet is fulfilled in the kingdom of God (in Jewish phrase "the Great Redemption") can my desire be granted. But you who have shared my trials shall also share my glory. For there, "at my table in my kingdom," you will have part in the heavenly redemption feast. Victorious in the new Jerusalem you shall sit on the "thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David"' (Ps 122<sup>5</sup>).

Paul also speaks not only of Christ as the 'Passover' sacrifice of Nisan 14, but as the wave-offering of new wheat lifted up to God on 'Firstfruits' (Nisan 16), the 'third day' after Passover. This Apostle was therefore naturally (and in the present writer's view quite justly) claimed by the Quartodecimans, or 'observers' of Nisan 14, as supporting their practice. In fact, the Fourth Evangelist does well, he does as we should expect from an *Ephesian*, in treating the Farewell Supper as a Kiddush of Passover and not the Passover banquet itself, for Ephesus since apostolic times was the stronghold of Quartodecimanism (Euseb., *HE.*, V. xxiv.). But why does he substitute a different rite for the authentic consecration of wine and bread (*ἄpros*, not the *mazzoith* prescribed for Passover)? If intent on the lesson of 'cleansing,' why does he not mention the handwashing of the Kiddush between its two Thanksgivings?

Tendencies already apparent in the Synoptic accounts of the Miracle of the Loaves in Galilee offer the best explanation for the cancellation from Jn 13 of the institution of the Eucharist. For it is self-evident that the description of the Galilean scene where Jesus blesses and breaks the bread, distributing it through His disciples to the seated multitude, has been assimilated in every one of our six narrations to the eucharistic rite as practised in the churches *before* the brotherhood repast, or Agapé. This shows a strong tendency present at least among the churches of Petrine, or Jewish-Christian, origin, to make of the Eucharist a simple 'grace *before* meat.' In their observance the 'breaking of bread' was no doubt also commemorative, but not exclusively characteristic of the Farewell Supper, since even the two disciples at Emmaus recognize it as distinctive of Jesus, though we

cannot assume them to have been present at this. But the typical Christian Agapé, even though prefaced by the eucharistic thanksgivings, had so little distinctive of 'the night in which Jesus was betrayed' that the wine which symbolized Jesus' outpoured blood is habitually treated as non-essential. The fraternal banquet (Agapé) was merely prefaced by a 'breaking of bread' in memory of the Lord (Ac 2<sup>42</sup> 61<sup>t</sup>).

On the other hand, the practice prescribed by Paul in 1 Co 11 as 'from the Lord' has paramount historical authority. We may suppose that making the Eucharist a 'grace *after* meat' was a change of order to that observed in the Greek *θίασος* which *terminated* with similar solemnities. The change may have been made in the interest of religious effect as well as conformity to Greek custom; at all events 1 Co 11<sup>20-22</sup> seems clearly to imply this order. But it is impossible to discredit Paul's report of what actually took place at the Farewell Supper. Jesus' action on this supreme occasion may have been only a heightening of His customary action at every weekly 'consecration' of the Sabbath, if not at every supper. This would account for its familiarity even to disciples not present on the supreme occasion. But, to say nothing of the improbability of Jesus' neglecting the pious duty of the Kiddush on the eve of Passover, it would reverse all principles of historical criticism to subordinate the narrative of Paul to mere later Synoptic report. 1 Co 11<sup>23-25</sup> gives the ultimate record of fact. Our problem is to account for the departures from fact in John.

1. The departure from fact in the eucharistic discourse attached to the Synoptic story of the Miracle of the Loaves in Jn 6 is simply in line with other heightenings of Synoptic tradition in John, made in the interest of religious edification. It is the Midrashic method of the Synagogue carried out with full liberty of application under the Pauline rule, 'Let all things be done unto edification.' In five earlier instances Mark, Matthew, and Luke show the same tendency to assimilate the story of the Feeding of the Multitude to eucharistic ritual as practised at the Agapé. It should not then greatly surprise us to find in Jn 6 a more extreme example of the same tendency, for this Evangelist has no literary scruples about anachronistic anticipations. He is simply more concerned than his predecessors to give to the universally practised Agapé that solemnizing touch of the 'breaking of bread' which belonged to the symbolism of the Farewell Supper. We should expect the writer of 1 Jn 5<sup>6-8</sup> to show an extreme concern for this,

as does his slightly later contemporary Ignatius. It was a vital point of orthodox teaching against various sects of ablutionists, who preached a Christ coming 'by water only.' But why does he say nothing about the institution of the Eucharist, either before or after the Farewell Supper, substituting at the point where Lk 22<sup>24-27</sup> relates the lesson of service the measure of greatness, the strange new rite of Footwashing?

As regards order it is interesting to observe that the ancient liturgy of *Didaché* has both a 'grace before meat' and a 'grace after meat' in chs. ix. and x. respectively. The former consists of the extremely ancient thanksgiving (1) over the cup: 'We thank thee for the vine of thy servant David (Ps 80<sup>8-17</sup>), of which thou hast given us understanding through thy servant Jesus'; (2) over the broken bread (κλάσμα): 'We thank thee for the life and understanding which thou hast made known to us through thy servant Jesus.' To this Thanksgiving for the Bread is attached a prayer for the Gathering of the Elect substantially equivalent to the tenth Benediction of the *Shemoneh Esreh*, a Passover theme such as we might expect to be appended to the Kiddush blessing of the loaf in the special rite for the eve of Passover. These two thanksgivings of *Did.* ix. are directed to be uttered *before* the δέεινον. After it (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι) two more thanksgivings are prescribed similar in subject but more Pauline or Johannine in coloration, followed by a closing Prayer for the Church (*Did.* x. 5) strongly reminding us of the High-Priestly Prayer of Jn 17. Careful comparison would be required to determine what relation, if any, subsists between these prayers of the *Didaché* and those of the Kiddush for the eve of Passover on the one side, and the discourses and prayer of Jn 13-17 on the other. It is at least conceivable that the thanksgiving before the δέεινον in *Did.* ix. may represent the usage of Jewish-Christian churches following a Petrine tradition, and that these have been combined by attachment after the δέεινον with two parallel thanksgivings in *Did.* x., representing Gentile-Christian or Pauline usage.

2. However this may be, there can be no reasonable doubt that the Farewell Supper, with its connected Discourses and High-Priestly Prayer for the Church, in Jn 13-17 reflects the mode of observance in the Church at Ephesus of rites for the eve of Passover corresponding to the Jewish Kiddush for the same occasion. But the problem of chief importance to us is the substitution of the rite of Footwashing for that of the Eucharist as object-lesson for the Farewell Discourses.

Robert Eisler, in his article entitled 'Zur Fusswaschung am Tage vor dem Passah (Ev. Joh. 13<sup>2-16</sup>)' in the *ZNW* for 1913 (xiv. 3, pp. 268-270), gives certain hints which are of great service for our inquiry. He quotes from Servian's comment on *Aen.* iv. 167, to prove that washing of the feet of the bride was a current pagan ceremony preceding nuptials. It would not be more difficult for us to imagine John making use of heathen practice for his symbolism here than in Jn 2<sup>1-11</sup>. But Eisler goes further. He cites Rabbinic sources to prove that the observance was not unknown to the ancient Semitic world also, and to the Jewish world of early Christian times. In addition he cites from Pauly a passage indicating that in Jewish religious legend Passover was held to symbolize the mystical marriage of Israel with Yahweh: 'Pendant la fête de Paque, la Fiancée est introduite sous le dais nuptial, et Israël, ayant terminé de compter ses jours d'impureté, commence à compter ses jours de pureté.'

It is curious that so sharp-sighted a critic as Eisler should omit from his parallels exactly that passage which to others might seem most germane of all, certainly that which best explains the whole treatment in the Fourth Gospel of the triumphant 'hour' of Jesus' glorification. For the Johannine representation of the triumph of Christ, when as Son of Man he is 'lifted up' and returns to the Father, is the most splendid of all expositions of Quartodecimanism. To John that 'hour' of Jesus' return to the Father is the climax of the whole drama. Everything advances to it from its first tolling at the symbolic Marriage in Cana (Jn 2<sup>4</sup>) to the crisis of the Appeal of the Greeks, when Jesus faces and accepts the Cross (12<sup>23-33</sup>). That 'hour' of the 'lifting up' is the Passover of God, the divinely appointed fulfilment of the third and great Redemption. And the eve of that Christian Passover is the Church's preparation, her 'Consecration' for entrance, after her conflict with the world is over, into the joy of her Lord, the 'Marriage Supper of the Lamb.' From this Quartodeciman point of view one theme alone is completely appropriate to the Farewell Supper. It is Purification of the Bride. Paul (or Deuteropaul) speaks of it as the 'great mystery' of Christ's purification of His bride the Church (Eph 5<sup>23-27</sup>):

'For the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ also is the head of the Church, being himself the saviour of his body. . . . Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it (ἀγιάσει αὐτήν), having cleansed it by the wash-



ing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself a glorious bride, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.'

For John the conception of the Crucifixion as the great Passover of world-redemption involved also an adaptation of the Kiddush or Consecration of Passover. This, and not Passover itself, was the real occasion of the Farewell Supper, when with 'his own,' elect and beloved, Jesus had celebrated the preparatory 'Sanctification.' To bring this Supper of the Lord into right relation with the heavenly banquet to which it looks forward, it seemed advisable to our Ephesian evangelist to exclude all other themes, leaving only such as pertain directly to the Purification of the Church, whose members must be cleansed from post-baptismal sin 'by washing of water with the word' (Eph 5<sup>26</sup>; cf. Jn 15<sup>3</sup>) before sharing in the heavenly Passover. They must be cleansed even from faults like Peter's, not yet realized, but hereafter to be understood (13<sup>7</sup>).

John would make the Christian 'sanctification of Passover' a preparation day. Consequently his Farewell Supper retains nothing from Synoptic tradition save what conduces to this end. *Didache* supplies the key to this mode of thought. It also has two requirements in preparation for the eucharistic feast: (1) Exclusion of the unfit. 'Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist save such as have been

baptized into the name of the Lord; for concerning such an one the Lord said, Give not that which is holy to the dogs. . . . If any be holy let him come; if any be not, let him repent' (ix. 5; x. 6); (2) Purification of the already baptized: 'Make previous confession of your sins, that your sacrifice (*θυσία*) may be pure; and if any have a quarrel with his neighbour let him not meet with you till they be reconciled; that your sacrifice be not defiled. For this is a word spoken by the Lord: At every place and time bring me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name is marvellous among the heathen' (*Did.* xiv. 1-3).

Similar 'sanctification' in preparation for the heavenly Redemption Feast is the theme of John in his story of the Farewell Supper. From Lk 22<sup>21-23</sup> he takes his embellished account of the exclusion of the traitor. From the verses which follow (24-28) he takes the lesson of mutual service, the least by the greatest. But instead of the washing of hands belonging to the Jewish Kiddush he substitutes a rite of the Ephesian Church, a washing of the feet of the Bride. In 13<sup>10</sup> it is interpreted to symbolize removal of post-baptismal sin, that all the Church's members may be sanctified, cleansed by the washing of water with the word. Thus the Bridegroom, in due time, will 'present her to himself a glorious bride, holy and without blemish.'

## In the Study.

### *Virginibus Puerisque.*

#### Hidden Treasure.

BY THE REVEREND N. F. TRIPP, HEATON VICARAGE, BOLTON.

'The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden.'—Mt 13<sup>44</sup> (R.V.).

THE other day I came across a most exciting book about divers and treasure. It was not a tale, but a true account of what Italian divers had been doing. By means of new inventions they had been able to go much deeper down under the sea than men had ever gone before, and they had successfully salvaged cargoes and treasure that had seemed lost for good and all.

But the most exciting part of the story was con-

nected with the wreck of a liner named the *Egypt*. It had been sunk off the rocky coast of Cape Ushant in France in water 400 feet deep. The first thing was to find the wreck. This took a long time. There were disappointments and mistakes and dangers, and then when the wreck was found the real task began. They didn't succeed in getting the treasure, because these poor men were blown up while working on another wreck. Now others have taken up the task, and in the paper some months ago I saw that at last the treasure of over a million pounds was laid bare. However, another disappointment had come, for the weather had turned so rough that work had to be suspended until next year. In the meantime there is no saying what changes may be brought about by storms and

tidal currents. So perhaps the work will have to be begun all over again.

Hunting for treasure on land or sea is full of excitement, danger, and disappointment, especially the last, and it is only those who can persevere who may hope in the end to succeed, and to have something to show for their pains. But though this is so we all love treasure-hunting. I think with boys the favourite stories are stories about treasure-hunting. One of the books that nearly every boy has read is called *Treasure Island*, and if you come across a boy who has not read it you are safe in recommending him to read it.

Treasure is usually only found after persevering search, as we have said, but it is not always so. Sometimes people find treasure by chance. We read now and then of workmen excavating and digging up a hoard of coins, or a farmer working in his field and unearthing some buried treasure. When we read things like this in the paper we wish it would happen to us.

Some years ago several papers had treasure hunts as competitions. The prizes were buried, and in the paper appeared a story giving clues as to where the prize might be found. Very exciting and popular were these competitions.

But we need not have a pretend treasure hunt, for, if we will, we may all join in a real treasure hunt. It is treasure that no one can find but we ourselves. Even God cannot find it without us. It is a treasure worth finding, for it makes all the difference to us when it is found. The Lord Jesus, who told us of it, called it by different names, but they all show how great it is. Sometimes He called it the Kingdom of Heaven, *i.e.* something which can make life heaven. Sometimes He called it Eternal Life, *i.e.* something that can make life so full and exciting that it can go on for ever. Did you ever suspect there was this treasure hidden? Is it not worth trying to find it?

But don't try to look for it alone. You will probably never find it, if you do that. No one but you can find it, but you cannot find it unless you have Jesus to help you. You need a companion. He is the One who knows the signs of the presence of this treasure, and can keep you from missing the spot where it lies. And besides that He brings a map with Him. The map is His Cross. And this Cross shows where the treasure lies. It points to the spot. It points in different directions for each of us, but the truest way of thinking of the Cross is as the great big capital 'I' which takes up so much space in our life crossed out.

### 'How do you do?'

BY THE REVEREND GORDON HAMLIN, B.A.,  
CARDIFF.

{ 'The tongue of the just is as choice silver.'—Pr 10<sup>20</sup>.

I wonder how many of you know the name of that most interesting country which is north of India, east of Russia, and west of China. Now, think carefully; have any of you got it? Did I hear some one say Tibet? Yes, it is Tibet: a land where there are all sorts of strange customs. Let me tell you about one of them. When two friends meet and want to say, 'How do you do?' they poke out their tongues as far as they will go!

Now, in our land, that would be considered a very rude thing to do, wouldn't it? And so it is! We should all be ashamed to be seen doing it. But that is not a bit rude in Tibet. There it is a sign of good friendship, just as when we shake hands; and when you think about it, does not that custom, which seems so strange to us, stand for something very attractive indeed? For its meaning is: 'I'm not going to say anything nasty *to* you; nor *about* you, behind your back. I'm going to speak *up for* you; and be friends *with* you.' They know why a good man prayed one day that prayer we find in the Bible:

Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth;  
And keep the door of my lips.

And although the people of Tibet haven't read our New Testament, they understand all the same what St. James meant when he wrote about the tongue. I wonder what horrid things he had been hearing, to make him write such strong words about little tongues causing big troubles. There must have been something the matter; for listen to him: 'The tongue is a little member and boasteth great things. Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth! And the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity . . . it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison. . . .' That is severe enough, but it isn't the worst thing he says in that chapter! Oh dear! I wonder whose nasty tongue had been wagging:

If you are tempted to reveal  
A tale some one to you has told  
About another, make it pass,  
Before you speak, three gates of gold.

These narrow gates—first, 'Is it true?'

Then, 'Is it needful?' in your mind  
Give truthful answer; and the next  
Is last and narrowest, 'Is it kind?'



And if to reach your lips at last  
 It passes through these gateways three,  
 Then you may tell the tale, nor fear  
 What the result of speech may be.

But in Tibet when they say 'How do you do?' in their own special way, they mean far more than this. They know, and so do we, how merry and kind our words can be; how friendly and loving our speech can be. When we *think* as well as speak, and *love* as well as talk, then that text in the Book of Proverbs comes true: 'The tongue of the just is as choice silver.'

What a great story that is about the way Jesus used to speak. One day His enemies sent a troop of soldiers to arrest Him; but they came back empty-handed. 'Why have ye not brought him?' the chief priests demanded with anger. Then those soldiers gave this amazing reply: 'Never man spake like this man!' They were spell-bound as they listened to our Lord. For behind His words was a lovely mind, and behind His lovely mind was a loving heart.

### The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

#### The Atrophy of Unused Powers.

'Take therefore the talent from him.'—Mt 25<sup>28</sup>.

We have talents of the body, such as strength, endurance, swiftness, gracefulness, and the like. We have talents of the mind and spirit, such as judgment, observation, memory, imagination, feeling, will, and the higher powers of conscience, and the capacity for communion with God as His children. Now the most perfect man is he who keeps all his God-given capacities in use, and enlarges them by use. But few men in fact do so. We might roughly divide men into three classes from this standpoint.

The first class use only the lowest talents committed to them. If his bread is certain, and his drink assured, and the wherewithal to clothe himself attainable, such a man is content. And he thinks, further, that all the world needs to cure its evils is more bread and more recreation.

Now let us consider the second class—the brain-workers. Such men undoubtedly get much out of the world. They get not only the higher intellectual things, but the bread that the first class valued so highly that it sought for nothing else. But this second class has its limitations. It is blind to the higher talents which fit them for

heroism, for saintliness, for communion with God, and so they gain their ends by losing all these.

Now let us take the third class—those who seek to use their highest God-given capacities aright. Such men generally make the best use of the lower talents also. Infirmarys for the body have owed their origin to pity for the soul: schools have been opened that free play might be given to the spirit: sanitary laws enacted, that religious life might become possible by the deliverance of men from their foul surroundings. Who would have lifted a voice for the slave that thought of him only as a debased human being? or who would have built a reformatory for the culprit child, if he saw nothing beyond the slouching gait and the evil eye? The most august structures of the world have been reared in the service of faith: the noblest charities, the finest results of learning, the best institutions of law and justice, every greatest thing the world has ever seen represents the fruitfulness of the religious talents.

Now all living members, whether of body or mind, require use or exercise. The unused muscle gradually dwindles and disappears: there is no need to come and remove it; want of use removes it. Fish which live in underground waters lose their sight wholly. So it is in the spiritual world. The unused talent dies. Hence one sees some old people absolutely callous. The capacities for loving and serving God, the capacities for a true spiritual life, are all but taken from them.

And how few are aware of this possibility, of this tremendous fact! That they are really dwarfing their whole nature—they do not dream for a moment of such a catastrophe. On the contrary, they often imagine they are getting above religion, growing too competent and wise to be any longer subjected to its authority, or inconvenienced by its claims. They think themselves wiser now than in the past, and that it is the evidence of religion that is weaker. They do not see or suspect that this very fact is evidence itself that the process of loss is far advanced, that they are close on the brink of being men who for this world have lost their souls: they do not understand that the talent that is unused is withdrawn: that the spiritual capacities given them for communion with God are taken from them.

If we neglect our daily morning and evening prayer—our communion with God—we will soon come to feel it an irksome task. This is the first sign that we are losing our capacity for prayer.

If we give up family prayer, cease our attendance at public worship, at Holy Communion—what will the result be? Simply this, we will lose all desire for these, and, later, we will lose the very power and capacity for prayer and worship. Finally, we will feel no need whatever of them. That is the last stage. God's judgment has already been executed—'Take the talent from him.'

It is a terrible thing that this judgment 'take the talent from him' is being executed every day before our eyes. An English poet writes thus sadly :

I remember, I remember,  
The fir trees dark and high ;  
I used to think their slender tops  
Were close against the sky :  
It was a childish ignorance,  
But now 'tis little joy  
To know I'm farther off from heaven  
Than when I was a boy.

Let no one comfort himself in the activity of his mind on the subject of religion. That is one of the things to be dreaded. To be always thinking and debating about the great questions of religion without using the spiritual talents committed to us of God is just the way to lose the talents most rapidly, and to close up the mind in spiritual darkness. This is not the way to know God. God is known only by them that receive Him into their faith, their love, their deep want—known only as He is enshrined within us, cleansing our hearts from their wrong and uncharitable feelings, and bringing all our aims and thoughts into captivity to His love.

Our subject is one of judgment ; if we be faithful, we must apply it in all its severity to our lives and hearts. 'Judge yourselves, that ye be not judged.' Do not let any of us urge : my talent is small : it matters not whether I use my spiritual influence or not : whether I am dealing honestly in my business, acting unselfishly at home : it matters not how I use the small means committed to my charge. So, no doubt, argued the man of the parable, and the end of that man was, 'Cast ye the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness.'

Through the tender mercy of our God, and through our faithfulness in this our day of grace, may we so use the talents committed to us here, that in the after world we may be greeted with the words : 'Well done, good and faithful servant ; thou hast been faithful in a few things : I will make thee ruler over many things, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> R. H. Charles, *Courage, Truth, Purity*, 178.

## SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT.

### A Moral Equivalent to War.

'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.'—Lk 9<sup>23</sup> (R.V.).

'He saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him.'—Mt 9<sup>9</sup>.

There is no surer mark of the decline of a nation than unwillingness on the part of its manhood and womanhood to respond to the call of the heroic. It sometimes happens that after a long period of peace and prosperity a nation becomes softened in its moral fibres ; it prefers safety to adventure, comfort and ease to the rigours of strenuous endeavour, and self-indulgence to self-sacrifice. There can be no progress unless a people continually feels the inspiration of self-sacrifice.

No one can doubt that much of the heroism in the annals of our race is associated with war and training for war. The story of the holding of the Pass of Thermopylæ, of how Horatius kept the bridge, of the defence of Lucknow, of the Charge of the Light Brigade—these and kindred stories have thrilled us from our earliest years. Blot out from the pages of the past the records of brave fights against great odds, of long marches on short rations, of the willing self-sacrifice of individuals to save their comrades, of deeds of sublime daring, and we have not only robbed history of much of its lustre, but we have infinitely impoverished the life of humanity.

We are all hoping that in the coming years the nations will abolish conscription and reduce armaments to the lowest possible limits. But are we right? If war evokes great virtues, does not that constitute a strong case for it, unless indeed it can be shown that those virtues can be called forth in some other way?

Can we find a moral equivalent to conscription? What is needed is a discipline that will enable us to endure hardness, and will train in us habits of self-sacrifice and consideration for others. It ought not to be difficult to discover such a discipline. The late Professor William James, the American philosopher, suggested that the youth of the country should undertake the disagreeable tasks of industry for a period of two or three years : 'To coal and iron mines, to freight trains, to fishing fleets in December, to dish-washing and window-cleaning, to road-building and tunnel-making, to foundries and stoke-holes, to the fumes of sky-scrapers would our gilded youth be drafted off according to their choice, and get the childishness knocked out of



them, to come back into society with healthier ideas and soberer sympathies. We should get toughness without callousness, authority with as little criminal cruelty as possible, and cheerful work done cheerily, because the duty is temporary and threatens not as now to degrade the whole remainder of one's life.' The idea may seem fantastic, but it does not sound half so strange as it did twenty years ago.

Can we find a moral equivalent to war? Can we discover a discipline and an experience which will evoke the heroic qualities in human nature to the same extent as war? Is there a way of life for which we can volunteer, and by treading which we can be virile even in days of peace, and can find boundless opportunities for self-forgetting, self-sacrificing service? Is there any method whereby we can rise above our dull, conventional levels and live and die as heroes? The gospel answers that there is. It is the way of the Cross. 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.'

1. *Let him deny himself.*—It is both the strength and the weakness of military service that it demands the denial of the self. It comes as a shock to the newly enlisted soldier to learn that his individuality must be suppressed. He is known by a number and not by a name. His self is denied. He has become part of a larger whole. He is under authority, and his individual opinions and wishes count for nothing. His comfort and life are but as the dust in the balance when weighed against the victory of the cause. And it says much for human nature and its latent capacities that even so machine-like a discipline does not crush out all individuality. Again and again, in the hour of crisis, the self, that has been submerged, asserts itself, not for its own ends, but for the triumph of the cause, or the saving of the life of a friend.

The discipline which Christ imposes on us is of a far higher and freer kind. He demands not the suppression of individuality, but the voluntary surrender of the will; not blind obedience, but willing and intelligent and loving service. But He asks of us utter faithfulness and uttermost obedience without our counting the cost.

The soldier, when he leaps over the parapet, does not stay to consider what will be the effect on his business at home if he is wounded or falls in the battle. That issue has already been faced, and it counts for nothing in comparison with the victory of the cause. But, on the battlefields of daily life, we are continually pausing to ask what will be the effect on our business or on our prospects in life if we

are utterly loyal to the demands of Jesus. We must deny ourselves. What do our prospects matter in comparison with the victory of Jesus Christ in the age-long war which He is waging with the forces of evil? Christ appeals to all the heroism that is latent within us, and bids us live and fight as brave men and true.

2. *Let him take up his cross daily.*—Most men before they volunteer for active service have to fight an inward battle. They say to themselves, 'My will will no longer be my own. I shall be exposed to danger, to hardship, to wounds, to death. Am I willing to pay the price?' And when they have brought themselves to the point at which they are able to answer in the affirmative, they take up the cross. They are masters of whatever awaits them. Death has been robbed of its sting. They have fought their battle and won the victory. When the day of testing comes being human they will fear, but they will not have to fight the inward battle over again. They have but to renew the vow that they made in their great hour of decision.

Have not some of us drifted into a kind of Christian discipleship, without passing through the great hour of self-surrender and of the acceptance of the Cross as the law of our life, with which it should begin? Did we pause to remind ourselves that to accept Christ means hardship and sacrifice and wounds and, often, material loss? It means an act of self-surrender which we must renew every day we live. And, if we do so, we shall find that the common walks of life are full of romance and adventure, and we shall discover opportunities for deeds of heroism and self-sacrifice as glorious as any that are wrought on the battlefield.

3. *And follow me.*—These words are capable of more than one interpretation. They are usually taken to refer to the imitation of Christ. He has left us an example that we should walk in His steps. That interpretation is, of course, correct so far as it goes. But the picture that presents itself, as we read these words, is that of Jesus Christ, the Leader of a New Humanity, calling on men to follow Him in a great campaign against the sin, selfishness, suffering, and sorrow of the world.

Think of Garibaldi's famous appeal for volunteers: 'I offer you new battles and fresh glory. Whoso is willing to follow me shall be received among my own people, but it will be at the price of great exertions and great perils. I require nothing of you but hearts filled with love to your country. I can give you no pay, no rest, and food will have to be eaten where it is found. Whoever

is not satisfied with these conditions had better stay behind.' And it was in words similar to these that Jesus, the Captain of our salvation, addressed men.

Think of the heroism, virility, and self-sacrifice which Christian discipleship has evoked in the past. Think of the missionaries of the Cross who have traversed mountains and deserts and rivers, and have walked without fear among barbarous peoples, winning fresh victories and glories for the name of Christ. Think of those who have braved the perils of the leper house and the horrors of towns swept by cholera or plague. Think of those who, disdaining comfort and ease, have given their lives to rescue and succour the wounded and the fallen, sustained by the Master's words, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.' Think of those who have given their lives to the service of little children, and have saved them from degrading labour and debasing surroundings, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me.' Think of those who have deliberately chosen poverty in preference to wealth, for the service of the Kingdom of God. Think of the thousands, throughout the ages, who, in humble and obscure places, have sought not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and who, in their own degree, have given their lives as a ransom for many. Thinking of these things we see that the Way of the Cross provides a sphere for heroism and self-sacrifice, and a discipline that produces the noblest virtues. 'Peace has her victories no less renowned than war.'<sup>1</sup>

### THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

#### At a Patriarch's Altar.

'Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering.'—Gn 22<sup>d</sup>.

1. Where did this writer of long ago get his literary style? It must have come straight out of the simplicity of his own heart and the magnificence of his theme. This is a piece of great writing, with a music and a majesty which the lapse of ages cannot destroy. Its most notable feature is its reticence. There is an art which conceals art, and that is great art. But there is an even greater art which is so much one with Nature that it is unconscious of itself. It is found in its perfection here.

A decisive exposition of this passage was given

<sup>1</sup> H. M. Hughes, *Faith and Progress*, 195.

some fifty years ago by Dr. J. B. Mozley in his *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*—one of those expositions which lets light in upon a theme once for all. As there are certain ideas and ideals afloat in the social atmosphere of our time—certain conceptions of personal duty and social decency, and the Divine imperative, to a certain extent at least, appeals to us through these—so in early ages there were certain sets of ideas generally accepted, and the God of a growing revelation had to use them even while He was leading men above and beyond them. This principle is, of course, employed in every form of teaching—the accommodation of lesson and method to the stage the pupil has reached. For infants, kindergarten; for older pupils, the higher standards; for real scholars, the heights and the depths—the pupil is not treated at one stage as he is at another. This also is God's method with that fretful and difficult pupil, humanity. He dealt so with the patriarchs. Indeed, He deals so with ourselves.

There is a second consideration which helps to mitigate the difficulties of the story for the reader of to-day: it is the duty of setting the whole incident in the light of its end. If a message came to men in the language of their own day and left them on the level where they had been, we might reasonably say of it that it was merely the product of the age to which it belonged. If a message came to men in the language of their own age, and left them lower and baser than it found them, we might say that it was but the re-awakening of the savage in man's soul, the gravitation of the pit into which he is always liable to tumble. But if a message comes to men in the language of their own age and leaves them higher and better and wiser than it found them, must there not be something of the Divine about it, something of the forward and upward call which is one of the chief proofs of a real revelation? That is what we have in this passage. Some contemptuous modern spirits dismiss it as the mere story of a human sacrifice; but when it is read to the end it proves to be the story of the *arresting* of a human sacrifice. At the end of it, is not Abraham greater in stature, and is not the God of a progressive revelation seen more clearly? But to the story itself.

2. 'It came to pass that God did prove Abraham,' or, in Dr. Moffatt's rendering, 'God put Abraham to the test.' There is no difficulty about that, because for every man, whether he be of Abraham's stature or not, life is a place of proving and testing and discipline. Our scruples begin when we come to the nature of this test.



Lecky tells a story about a man in Thebes who wanted to become a monk. The abbot asked him whether he had anybody belonging to him. 'I have a son,' he said. The abbot replied, 'Take your son and throw him into the river.' The man went off to carry out the command, and the monks, having thus tested the whole-heartedness of his purpose, stopped him when he was dragging his son to the river's brink. It was a test, and a sore test; but was it a right and fair test? Was it a test which in the faintest degree suggests to us the voice of God? Not in this, the Christian era; but there is much meaning in the fact that Abraham's story dates from a time long before the Christian era dawned. It is very important in Abraham's case to call our historical sense to our aid. For in that early age, one of the ruling ideas from which nobody entirely escaped was the absolute power of the community over the individual and of the parent over the child. In Greek story there is the legend of Agamemnon and his attempted sacrifice of his daughter Iphigenia: people saw the pathos and the pain of it, but they did not see anything morally impossible in it. If we add to that the fact that human sacrifice was probably not infrequent in the tribes of Abraham's environment, it is possible to feel how thoroughly the story belongs to its period.

So there was started in that great soul the conflict which is of the essence of all tragedy—the conflict between rival duties, often a far keener conflict and more rending to the heart than the conflict between right and wrong. On the one hand, there was the instinct which told him that he, the friend of God, the man for whom God had done so much, must rise at least as high as the level of his pagan neighbours and give his best and uttermost to God. On the other hand, there was his love for his son. And, added to his love, there was his duty to all the future of his race, which, set in the light of the promise, had looked so fair and sure. Some who gave sons, brothers, husbands, in the Great War had to confront the same conflict in their own storm-swept souls—the instinct of personal tenderness and family loyalty wrestling in them with what seemed a higher call, the call to self-abnegation for a great cause.

3. The core of the story is the thought which runs like a golden thread through the whole history of sacrifice—that what God desires is the spiritual thing, the offering and dedication of the will. It goes without saying that we must keep our sense of time, and not turn Abraham all at once into a New Testament Christian. The world was yet

in its childhood, and the reign of visible and material symbols was not yet over. That was why 'Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in the thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.' Because Abraham reached to the best that he could attain of submission and devotion, God made his act the gateway of lessons and duties better still. If we interpret it so, we see it from the right angle and in the right light, and it becomes possible to stand with Abraham on Moriah and look straight across the ages to Calvary, even to Him who offered Himself without spot unto God.

The form in which the challenge came to Abraham's will is accidental—conditioned by times and surroundings: a challenge in such a form would be intellectually and morally impossible to-day. But the spirit of his response is the spirit of all sacrificial lives. They are to be found climbing Mount Moriah from all lands and ages—climbing the hard highway of self-surrender and self-renunciation until they shine above us like stars:

Look what a company of constellations!

Say can the sky so many lights contain?

Hath the great earth these endless generations?

Are there so many purified thro' pain?

So if this man seems very remote, doing things we can scarcely understand, and speaking the language of another age than ours, in another sense he is very close to us—especially close to those who wrestle with the hard mysteries of God's providence. We do well to learn from him the lesson of trust—of trust even in the darkest night, and of submission—of submission even to God's hardest demands. For us as for him the Lord will provide. How full and how loving that provision is we learn when we look away from ourselves, and behold, entangled for our sakes in the thicket of human need and sorrow, the lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.<sup>1</sup>

#### FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

##### The Discipline of Nature.

Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.'—Mt 5<sup>26</sup>.

It is a stern and relentless sentence, yet it is only the sentence which life passes upon us every day and to which we have grown so accustomed that we no longer feel its sternness. The whole pressure

<sup>1</sup> J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 51.

of Nature against the resistance of our wills is mediated to us under the aspect of law. And that law is infinitely exacting. No ignorance of its mandates will avail to ensure escape from their rigorous demands upon our obedience. It knows no favourites. It has no heart of pity and no will of enmity. Its last word to humanity is, 'Obey me, learn increasingly how to obey me, and by the necessity of my own nature I will be your faithful servant. But disobey me, and however unconscious or unintentional on your part the disobedience may be, you must pay for it to the uttermost farthing.'

All this we have long since learned to take account of, and to make our account with. We invariably accommodate ourselves to the decrees of Nature so far as we know them. We think, indeed, because we are always obeying that we are not obeying at all. The more ingrained habit grows, the more it becomes unconscious of itself. It is only where we are still ignorant of the invariable habit of Nature's activity or where we have imperfectly or recently learned it that we are feelingly aware of how exacting she can be. The fight with bodily disease in all its forms, the mastery of its various antecedents and occasions, are even now impressing that lesson upon us with a lively consciousness of its importance.

And the exactingness of Nature repeats itself in a greater or less degree throughout the whole regulation of our life as social habit. Government, law, every form and instrument of social order, tend to become heartless things. For them individuals are so many units of social force which must take their chance in the working of the general scheme. The social scheme itself, of course, is always capable of vast improvement even from the point of view of the individual. It can be bettered so as to offer to each individual a fuller opportunity of coming to himself, of entering into the fulness of his inheritance. But when it has done all it can for him, it is only to leave him a member of a society constituted, it may be, in closer accordance with the ideal form of human society, yet of a society still, of an order which must be as impersonal as possible in its exactingness just that it may continue to be an order.

Now we accept this inexorable exactingness and impersonality of the reign of law throughout life, simply because it is the verdict of experience upon life as we know it. But there is something in us which would transcend the exactingness of law. We are sure first of all that we ourselves are something more than we have ever succeeded in accom-

plishing, that the law which would mete out to us in exact proportion to what we have accomplished is essentially an unjust law. We know that when we have done anything worthy, it is after all something immeasurably less than what we aimed at doing, that the higher our conscious aim the more disappointing has the actual achievement seemed to us to be. From every point of view we feel our individual superiority to this social law which would so exactly determine us. Either we are taking life at its level, and then we develop the mere cunning which will—often, at least—help us to evade its decrees, or we must take life at a higher level than it reckons of, and then we feel its native insufficiency and injustice.

And again, if there is any good in us, we revolt against its decrees for others. We dare not treat our fellow-men with that impersonal exactingness which is the very essence of society as a mechanical or habitual movement. We feel that we are not giving at all if we are not giving infinitely more than any abstract claim could warrant. It is the heart in man that gives, and the heart never gives according to measure. And again, when the heart is once awake, we dare not claim all that according to some abstract scale of justice may seem to be our due. 'Pay me that thou owest' is a demand which few of us would dare to enforce outside the market-place. It is just the generous heart that knows that no one can be its debtor, that it is debtor to every heart whose warmth it has ever had the privilege to feel or even only to awaken.

And it is through this force within us as individuals, a force that comes from some transcendent force beyond us, that society is impelled to that reforming of itself which is the essence of human history. And may we not hope, nay, must we not individually make it our hope and our aim, that society and its laws may come closer and closer to the individual need, that government and law, if they must still act from without, if, indeed, they can never act save from without, may yet act so as to evoke and cherish all that is best in the individual and cease merely to make the attempt, necessarily futile, to restrain all that is worst in him? Is it impossible to hope that government, which is the instrument of the common life, should some day come to recognize the most elementary fact about human nature, that there is a kind of perverted nobility in it which will force it in mere revolt to become evil if it is callously and impersonally treated as evil, that the only thing that can expel evil is the patient and personal will of good, the will that men have called by the great name of



love? While our legal justice, as we must still, alas! for the bitter irony of it, call it, seeks to effect its object by mere restraint and the punishment which degrades, it must fail of its object. Society must learn to do its little measure of good shepherding, if only by making its punishment frankly human and reformatory. It is no dream, for our consciences are alive in this matter and we are making our feeble beginnings of reform in all the educational and preventive work which society has undertaken in this generation. But we *would* dream what can only as yet be counted as dreams, and hope that society might one day be able to commit the care of its moral derelicts, at least in the first stages of their fall, not to the chance officials of a routine system, but to the most Christ-like men and women within its borders. For this would be the noblest work the one could find to do, and perhaps the only sure hope of salvation which the others could be offered. A more righteously ordered society will do much to abolish the ugliest and most sordid forms of human evil, but the moral wastage of humanity will still be left for the Good Shepherds of humanity to seek and save.

But yet again let us remember the spiritual value of the exactingness of Nature and of all life's organization as habit. Without it our tenderness would never have become the strength that saves, our sympathy would never have gained the temper by which it answers to every varying strain of the mass in which it has to work. It is just the steady strain, the uniform urgency, of law that works the soft ore of our characters into the resisting steel which is the backbone of every human edifice. All the formulas we extract from life are to be distrusted, useful and even necessary as they are, because they are never adequate to the whole of life and because we are so ready to treat them as if they were. But the formula given in life itself is to be trusted absolutely, the formula according to which it works and by which it proves us. Against that formula we must measure ourselves in order to grow at all. Our education of the young, our tendance of the morally weak and immature, are but preparations for the moment when they will be able to undertake that further education of themselves. A man is not truly a man till he has begun to stand up to life, not as his enemy, but as the necessary discipline of his spirit. The learning what the formula of life can teach us is as various as our various characters, nor will it abate one jot or tittle of its special lesson for each. That is the law of liberty through which alone we can be fully

made. And the liberty into which we thus enter recognizes as its charter that word which at first sight seems so sinister and forbidding, 'Thou shalt not come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.'<sup>1</sup>

#### FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

##### Competition.

'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'—Mt 20<sup>26-28</sup>.

These men were all going up to Jerusalem together after their Lord, and not one but felt that the journey was fraught for them with some great and glorious result. Jesus had told them that for His part He was to be delivered into the hands of the Gentiles to be mocked, scourged, and crucified; but that on the third day He would rise again. The meaning of the Cross and the Resurrection they did not understand, and we can well believe they did not want to. What they did appreciate, however, and were very eager about, was the Kingdom which would eventuate. On that each man had set his heart, and was determined that he would make the most for himself out of it at the expense of his brethren. It is not an edifying spectacle: the closest adherents of Christ, on the very eve of His Passion, quarrelling over the spoils of His Kingdom which could be won for them only by His agony and death.

But is such a spectacle any worse than that of the men of this generation quarrelling? The strife goes on for foremost places in the new heavens and new earth, wherein righteousness should dwell, and for which our sons and brothers suffered and died. It can have but one end—chaos and ruin, unless we humble ourselves and come to the feet of Christ, the Prince of Peace, the only Author of Concord and Goodwill, and learn of Him what alone makes any one great, or brings profit and welfare to the people and the nations.

1. Christ does not forbid competition. He did not condemn the ambition of His followers, or their rivalry. He controlled and inspired them; He gave them a new direction and aim. And these were Service, Usefulness, the Ministry of Man, rather than personal pre-eminence or selfish gain. As the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it: 'Provoke one another unto love and good works.'

How completely Jesus reverses the current notions

<sup>1</sup> A L. Lilley, *Nature and Supernature*, 85.

of honour and glory may be realized when we discover that the word He uses for 'servant' actually means 'slave.' What a shock that word must have given to the men of His own generation when He used it to signify His ideal of greatness! To us it may indicate one who has no private or personal interests to seek, but who is wholly surrendered to the service of others. It is not really great to amass a large fortune merely that one may compel or buy the labour and subservience of one's fellows. Still less is it great to have inherited much and to live in idleness on the accumulations of the past. Small and mean is the man whose aim is to get as much as possible by doing as little as ever he can; and when he claims such a lot as his right at the expense of the community he is as tyrannical as any who insist on being ministered to, but refuse to minister. They only are great who are generous of themselves, their powers and opportunities, not to get, but to give, to produce and help.

2. But further, the test of genuine service according to Christ is sacrifice, and the endurance which that entails up to the bitter end. When the Sons of Zebedee demanded the foremost places in this Kingdom, Jesus could only pity their ignorance and lack of preparation. 'Are ye able,' He asked, 'to drink of my cup, and to be baptized with my baptism?' 'It is not for me,' He would say, 'to bestow as a favour or privilege the distinctions you seek: it is for you to deserve them by working and suffering in the measure in which you share my agonies and sacrifice.' Suffering and sacrifice have in themselves no merit or use. They are significant and justified only by the end for which they are endured. The end to be sought and served in Christ's Kingdom is, in this colloquy with His disciples, rather implied than expressed by the references to His own Passion. It means the making of this world a better and a happier place, and helping men to be more worthy to inhabit it. In short, Christ's ministry has as its aim abundance of life for the children of men. To such a ministry, faithfully undertaken, suffering and sacrifice are inevitable. All the time one is opposed by the evil that is in the world to desolate and destroy, the evil that is in men themselves to resist and deny our aims. Hence the Christian's cross, on which Christ so

constantly insisted. Therefore must one share the Cup and Baptism of the Son of Man, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.

After all, whence came our best blessings and highest privileges, such as life and liberty, peace and security, our purest inspirations and noblest ideals, but from services and sacrifices we can never repay? These gains are without money and without price, because coin can neither estimate their worth nor reward them? How much of sacrifice is there in the provision even of our food and other creature comforts, in the maintenance or restoration of our health, which cash cannot compensate.

Who, consequently, are entitled to our respect and reward? We refuse to recognize any claim to consideration in men who, having a monopoly in the necessities of life, leave a whole community to suffer for the want of these, in order that they themselves may secure greater gain or larger leisure.

'The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.' The Son of Man, He served Himself heir to humanity's faults and failures that He might atone for and retrieve them by the sacrifice of Himself, and to humanity's destiny that He might fulfil it by the service of His life. The greatness of that service was possible only to one so great as He. What is a grander heritage than the sovereignty of lives won by the service of the Cross? To Him, that loves them and hath loosed them from their sins in His own blood and made them a kingdom of priests to God, His Father, the multitude of the redeemed in heaven and earth ascribe the dominion and glory for ever. 'Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.'

How selfish ambition and envy are shamed and condemned by the Cross! How they are burned out of us by the love of the Cross! There we learn what alone shall be of consequence and satisfaction at last, there we receive the inspiration and power to minister, and so are raised with Christ to real and eternal glory.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> H. Smith, *The Economics of the Kingdom of God*, 3.



# Apologetics, and the Impact of Science upon Theological Thought.

BY PROFESSOR J. Y. SIMPSON, D.Sc., F.R.S.E., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

IN Dr. A. B. Bruce's admirable work entitled *Apologetics; or, Christianity Defensively Stated*, of which the latest reprint was issued in 1927, he spoke of Apologetic as being in his opinion 'a preparer of the way of faith, an aid to faith against doubts whencesoever arising, especially such as are engendered by philosophy and science.' So far as the question of mere impact, apart from results, is concerned, the characterization still stands, except that the words 'philosophy and science' should be read in the reverse order. In days when, on the one hand, the President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science can calmly make the bold claim that 'Science is perhaps the clearest revelation of God to our age,' and, on the other hand, the Russian authors of *The ABC of Communism* launch the world-wide attack of their movement on Religion from such a basis, amongst others, as that 'the natural sciences . . . are in irreconcilable conflict with all religious imaginings,' it is clear to those who believe they know their day and generation where the centres of intellectual pressure will lie in the immediate future. How far Scientific Humanism, presently sweeping like a prairie fire over wide areas of the plains of intellectualism in this country and the United States, will travel before it expends itself, is not easy to forecast. One thing is certain. Unless these issues are dealt with in a spacious and convincing manner, unless to a generation that is out for reality and done with phrases, that eternal and expanding truth which is in Christ Jesus is presented in word and represented in action that are vivid and intelligible in the light of the scientific and social progress of the day, there will have been an act of unfaithfulness to the significance of Christianity that may postpone its inevitable rediscovery to some far-distant date.

It would not be difficult to show that here and there amongst theological thinkers there is a keen realization of the situation. Dr. F. R. Tennant, discussing a theological curriculum, has committed himself to the statement that, 'whatever else be left out—the New Testament alone excepted—room should be found . . . for the essentials and fundamentals of Christian doctrine, as it stands

confronted with the science and philosophy of the present day.' Dean Inge has ventured the opinion that 'it is difficult for a man to accept orthodox Christianity as the Churches present it to him without treachery to his scientific conscience.' Dr. Percy Dearmer has recently envisaged a new movement in the Church which would not, like some others, look to the past for inspiration. 'The new movement will be very different. It will look forward, and will be based upon science and the Spirit of Christ.' And it is not inapposite to note that a Committee of the Church of Scotland, occupied with the Restatement of its Faith, has recommended that into an already existing 'Brief Statement of the Church's Faith' there should be introduced, amongst other changes, a new paragraph 'dealing with the scientific study of nature and of man.'

A great part of the present-day difficulty is that to the traditionally trained theological mind, the assault of doubt is still supposed to be 'especially engendered by philosophy' including psychology. Thus it is sometimes maintained in such quarters that the serious question to-day is whether religious experience may not be an illusion—a difficulty that could never have arisen if unsubstantiable claims for a religious consciousness as something *sui generis* had not been advanced. Otherwise the objection stultifies itself in rendering all experience nugatory, and in any case the illusion weapon is two-edged. It is not easy to assess the damage that has been done to religious thought by the Ritschlian stressing of a supposed thoroughgoing dualism between a realm of facts and a realm of values. There is no fact without its significance, no value but is associated with some fact. There is no dualism in Reality, although there may be a two-fold apprehension of a Reality which is ultimately one. And in its retreat into the sheerest subjectivity, in a vain endeavour, in Herrmann's words, to 'remain unentangled with the present-day development of free natural science,' Religion and its expression in such theology have presented the easiest of targets to resolute and soundly based attack. 'Natural Theology,' snapped out Ritschl in the presence of a student who had happened to

make a remark upon the subject in his presence, 'there's no such thing!' <sup>1</sup> Small wonder if to-day for many in the street and in the study who have had no religious experience of their own, it is men like Eddington and Jeans, Lodge and John Arthur Thomson who make them feel that religion is at all credible, and keep them uneasily aware that there is something there with which they may have yet to come to terms. Of the same general tendency, although again with many admirable qualities, is that intellectually arrogant, anti-developmental, agnostic and paradoxical Barthian movement, the final natural resting-place for whose devoted leaders looks like Rome.

If intellectual satisfaction is to be found, we shall have to get back to the world process, attracted and impressed by its orderliness, its self-consistency, its continuity and broad progressiveness, there to find the objective criteria which we require by which to orientate and estimate aright. For religion at its broadest is man's reaction as a personality to the universe as a whole—the assimilation of his being to the universal order; at its highest and intensest it is a mystical consciousness of spiritual union with Jesus Christ with objective verification. Religion is the sublimest outcome of that urge that has characterized the history of life from the beginning—that reaching out towards a richer, completer, more harmonious existence that has become fully conscious of itself in a human mind. The world in which we find ourselves is a particular kind of a world, and regarding that particularity, and the method of adjustment thereto, on its physical side, it is the business of science to teach us. But equally on its spiritual side is it a particular kind of a world, and in the teaching of Jesus, as, *e.g.*, on the value of goodwill and co-operation, on human solidarity, justice, and even monogamy, is disclosed the method of adaptation that alone will issue in a richer, more abundant life, individual, national, and international. Nothing can now prevent the historical phenomenon of Christianity from being subsumed under a developmental view of things, but on the other hand the whole world process is meaningless without the Incarnation. From the side of science, it is seen to be a process whose unity is even more impressive than its uniformity, with fundamental lines of structure and behaviour like the great cost of progress and the principles of sacrifice and service, that become dimly visible already in the realm of the inorganic, but are focused and made savingly clear for mankind in

<sup>1</sup> For the incident, see W. M. Horton, *Theism and the Modern Mind*, p. 96 n.

the Cross of Christ. It is a process in which He is the most significant event, the supreme manifestation of that Infinite Mind-Energy which constitutes the World-Ground. With the appearance of life came an incipient awareness of need, and the effort to satisfy that need, through some new relationship to the stimulating and challenging environment. The Lamarckian conception of 'appetency'—the idea of striving to satisfy a desire—is another such basal line of behaviour that runs throughout life into the realm of spirit. And as man found his spiritual needs satisfied in his growing understanding of that revealing and responding environment, which in its ultimate aspect is God, he came to realize that he was need-ed. It must be so; for Creation is the divine self-limited Kenosis, in which at long last man shares in the task of creation, and shares increasingly, as in the realm of human experience, its most distinctive contributions, in science, philosophy, poetry, and character, are brought to light. Man fulfils most completely the divine expectation, while achieving self-realization, as in service and sacrifice he ever, in growing freedom, gives of himself.

While it may be believed that along such lines as these, some aspects of Christian truth may be not so much defensively, as positively and constructively, reaffirmed for our generation, yet new issues are constantly arising. The recrudescence of cyclical views of things, the adjustments necessary upon the realization of the vastly increased antiquity of man, the whole problem of the relation of mind and brain, the implications of the Quantum laws with regard to Causality, the thoroughgoingness of the interpretation of organic Evolution as the winning of freedom, are some of the issues that have only recently appeared, or reappeared, above the horizon, and demand the most careful consideration by those who have the best interests of their day and generation at heart. What added content has been given, for example, within the last few years, as the result of archaeological discovery, to such an apostolic conception as 'the fulness of the time' (Gal 4<sup>4</sup>) and 'the end of these days' (Heb 1<sup>2</sup>)! We shall have to reach in some respects a new conception of the life and work of our Lord that will cover this enlarging sweep of human history. The mistake has been in supposing, so far as this has been done, that the Christian theology of any particular period is identical with the Christian revelation. It never has been so, and it never will be so. We must in God's name keep the gates of the Christian future



open, so far as we are concerned. The revelation of the love of God in Christ was given to man at a certain definite point in time, but it was not unconnected with much that preceded it, and it is a revelation whose content grows and swells with the experience of Christian men and women throughout the ages. In days when there begins to be some

rediscovery of the significance of Jesus, and of His impact upon the world process, nothing but a theology purged of evasion, mediævalism, unbalanced subjectivity, and distinguishing sharply between the verifiable and the unverifiable, although not necessarily discarding the latter, will commend itself to thinking men.

## Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., GLENFARG, PERTSHIRE.

SINCE our last Quarterly Review so many reports have come in, bearing on our subject, that we can only refer to a few of these. A detailed account would fill an ordinary volume. Nothing further need be said about Jericho at present, except that Professor Garstang returned to the site last autumn to renew his work there, and is engaged, among other things, in making a re-examination of the walls in view of the theory of their fall, which we suggested in our last article. 'What you wrote,' he says, 'brings to my mind certain deposits associated particularly with the ruins of the inner brick wall which have hitherto baffled explanation.' These deposits consist, he states, of 'immense pockets of burnt timber and white ash' at the foot of the wall and running down the slope until they impinge upon the remains of the outer wall. It is quite possible that a fresh examination of the places where these conditions are conspicuous, will result in the correctness of the theory we advocated.

A new field of excavation has been opened up at the ruins of Beth-zur ('House of [the mountain-god] Zûr,' or in later Hebrew, 'Cliff-house'). The site is at *Khirbet et-Tubeiqah*, near *Burj es-Sûr*, and about five miles north of Hebron. It was a town of Judah (cf. Jos 15<sup>68</sup>, 1 S 30<sup>27</sup> [in LXX], 1 Ch 2<sup>45</sup>, etc.), one of the fifteen places fortified by Rehoboam, and the head of a district in Nehemiah's time, 444 B.C. (Neh 3<sup>16</sup>), as well as a place of some importance after the Captivity. The undertaking is under the joint auspices of the Presbyterian Seminary of Chicago and the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. Professor O. R. Sellers, Professor W. F. Albright, Dr. Nelson Glueck, Dr. A. Saarisalo, and others have been directing the work, with an average force of over one hundred men. The town stands on the summit of a rocky

hill, 3325 feet above sea-level, the highest ruined town in Palestine. Its walled area could hardly have been more than four acres. It rises in terraces one above the other, so that it must have had the appearance of a gigantic *ziggurat*. The débris from one terrace has fallen down into the next, the average depth of it being only about three feet. The excavations, therefore, reveal an almost incredible mixture of sherds of all ages (about 3000 baskets full). Among these are innumerable stamped jar-handles, including eleven of the royal type. There are also four inscribed weights, all apparently of pre-exilic age. Two of these (one a *pim* and the other a *bega*) are extremely rare. In a cistern was found the impression of a Jewish seal of about the seventh century B.C., with two lines of an inscription reading clearly, 'Belonging to Gealyahu, son of the king.' The name is new, but is probably identical with Igeal, a descendant of king Joiachin (1 Ch 3<sup>22</sup>). The town does not seem to have been founded till 1900 or 1800 B.C., during the Hyksos age, and there is evidence that this first collection of houses was destroyed by fire about 1500 or a little earlier. The site remained unoccupied during most of the Late Bronze period.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For those readers who are interested in the dating of events, the following chronological scheme may be given as an accepted framework for Palestine (it is somewhat different for Egypt and Mesopotamia):

- |                 |                               |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| I. Stone Age,   | i. Palæolithic.               |
|                 | ii. Neolithic.                |
| II. Bronze Age, | i. Early, 2600-2000 B.C.      |
| "               | ii. Middle, 2000-1600 B.C.    |
| "               | iii. Late, 1600-1200 B.C.     |
| III. Iron Age,  | i. Early, 1200-600 B.C.       |
| "               | ii. Middle, 600-100 B.C.      |
| "               | iii. Late, 100 B.C.-A.D. 636. |

These represent the general succession of periods of

and was then rebuilt by the Israelites about the twelfth century. This second town also appears to have been brought to an abrupt end by some terrific conflagration about a century later, due perhaps to the Philistines. We can only await further news from this ancient Jewish site.

Most important discoveries have been made in Transjordan by Horsfield. At *Khirbet Baluah*, a site south of the upper Arnon in Moab, he has discovered a basalt stela, with several lines of an inscription, the characters of which do not belong to any known script. He believes, from the style of the figures on it, that it may be dated between 1400 and 1200 B.C. If this date be correct, it is much earlier than the one on the Moabite Stone (c. 842 B.C.), and indeed may antedate the earliest one known to us in Palestine—that in Ahiiram's tomb in Byblos (c. 1250 B.C.). He has discovered the reason for the importance of Moab in the Bronze Age: both Edom and Moab were then rich copper-producing countries, with a flourishing commerce and numerous towns. His researches fill a gap in the line of ancient towns running south along the edge of the desert, referred to in Gn 14, and have an important bearing on Patriarchal history. In 1929 Père Mallon, a Franciscan Director in Jerusalem, discovered what he believes to be the sites of the two ancient cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. The discovery led to considerable controversy in Britain and America at the time, but evidence bearing out the authenticity of the sites is said to be the feature of the latest excavations. The ruins are situated on dry land, about three miles east of the Jordan. The area covered by them is large, and one of the cities seems to have been four times the size of Jericho. The foundations of the houses have been found to be covered with ashes, and every indication bears out the Scriptural narrative that they were destroyed by fire. The view that the waters of the Dead Sea cover the site of the cities of the Plain is now generally discarded, for the level of the Sea has undoubtedly become lower since 2000 B.C., which is approximately the time when Sodom and Gomorrah perished. It may be possible,

civilization, but it must be remembered that the limits of possible error are very great, amounting in the earlier periods to perhaps several centuries. The particular Age to which objects belong is usually determined by the nature of the pottery found in the same stratum, though in this matter also perfect accuracy cannot be reached. But this problem has been worked out with such care by leading archæologists that the Age to which they belong can now be ascertained with tolerable precision.

therefore, that the Franciscan explorer's view is correct, though further evidence is still needed.

Professor Albright, who has carefully considered the whole question of the site of Tirzah, the early capital of Israel for over forty years, has identified it with *Tell el-Fârah*, seven miles straight north-east of *Nâblus* (Shechem). It has been variously located hitherto, but generally at *Tallûza*, a little east of Samaria. Albright, however, as the result of extensive search through the whole region, is convinced of the identification which he gives. The situation is remarkably good, with short exposed sections of a megalithic city wall at intervals, and lying on the main road from Shechem to Bethshan and Damascus. The mound is slightly over three hundred and thirty yards long, and more than two hundred in width. Albright has found pottery of every age on the surface, from 2000 B.C. downward, but mostly representing the period of the Judges and the united monarchy of Israel. In the past, *Tell el-Fârah* has been regarded as the site of Ophrah, the village home of Gideon. But such a large imposing mound could hardly represent the ruins of a village. There seems very good ground for believing that Albright has discovered the only site suitable for identification with Tirzah. If so, an excavation of this ancient capital might throw considerable light on the reigns of Jeroboam, his son Nadab, and the three adventurers, Baasha, Elah, and Zimri. Baasha was buried at Tirzah (1 K 16<sup>9</sup>), probably Elah also, as he was slain there while drinking in the house of one of his officers.

Excavations have been steadily going on at the great mound of Megiddo, on the Plain of Esdraelon, under the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. A feature of the earliest buildings is that the lower parts were of stone and the upper of unbaked mud brick. Even the city wall was probably of this nature. The débris in all such cases is just earth, to which the soft brick reverts after being rained upon and ploughed up for three thousand years or more. Practically everywhere, indeed, the masonry above the buried foundation course consists of 'three rows of hewn stone,' and no more—a feature of some of Solomon's buildings in Jerusalem. Wherever the third course is preserved, the upper surface has been burned black by some huge conflagration, showing that there must have been a layer of wood between the stones and the mud-brick superstructure. The Director, Mr. P. L. O. Guy, submitted a large piece of the charred wood for analysis to the Palestine Department of Agriculture, who in turn submitted it to the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, where it was pronounced



to be cedar. We thus have an apt illustration of the Solomonic style of building at Jerusalem (1 K. 7<sup>12</sup>): 'And the great court round about had three rows of hewn stone, and a row of cedar beams; like as the inner court of the house of the Lord, and the porch of the house.' Probably Megiddo, which lies on the direct road from Jerusalem to Phœnicia, was built by the same Phœnician masons (sent by king Hiram) who were employed on Solomon's buildings, after their completion of the latter. In a previous article we referred to the discovery of stables at Megiddo. These have now been entirely uncovered. They stand in units, which accommodate twenty-four horses each, with the necessary hitching posts or pillars. One building some sixty yards long by twenty-four wide comprised originally five such units, giving room for one hundred and twenty horses under one roof. A similar building, once thought to be barracks or a bazaar of small shops, was found by Bliss in the early nineties at *Tell el-Hesi* (ancient Lachish), and there is evidence that stables of the same kind with stone pillars existed at Gezer, Taanach, and other towns which lay close to the great trade routes.

We gave a brief account some time ago of Professor Montet's excavations at Tanis (the Biblical Zoan) in Egypt, the town which he identifies with Raamses, from which the Israelites set out on their flight to the desert. He has now discovered the whole town to have been built on sand. Temple, edifices, walls—everything rests on a foundation of sand. The probability, therefore, is that the site was a sandy island, several of which exist in the Delta. From the nature and large number of texts which he has discovered referring to Rameses II., he believes he has found further proofs that the town is identical with the Raamses of the Exodus. As yet, however, his excavations are only in their beginning. The site is so vast, there is so much removal of soil before the ancient level can be reached, and the transport of all this to a convenient distance occupies so much labour, that the time

has not yet come for deciding critical questions. Probably, if the tombs of the Tanite kings and governors (Dynasties xv., xxii.-xxiii.) could be located, valuable information would be obtained. These cannot be far away, for the inhabitants of the Delta could not have interred their dead in the desert, as those of Upper Egypt did. They must have constructed tombs, mostly of brick, within or quite near to their own town. Montet has already examined several adjoining hillocks, and a few strokes with the pick have revealed brick constructions at no great depth. If these be the royal tombs, it is not improbable that we are on the eve of some marvellous discoveries which will settle many disputed points, including the question whether this island town was the Avaris of the Hyksos and the Raamses of the Exodus, as Montet believes.

Excavations have been going on at several other places in Palestine besides those we have mentioned above. At Sepphoris, for instance, the capital of Galilee in the time of Christ, Professor Waterman of the University of Michigan and Professor Fisher of the Oriental School of Research in Jerusalem commenced operations last summer. At Bethshan work was resumed in the autumn, this being the eighth season which the Pennsylvania University Museum has devoted to the site. Much of the time has been spent on *Tell el-Hosn*, the old Canaanite part of the city. In the Dolmen Field, south-east of *Kerazeh* and north of *Tell Hum* (Capernaum) extensive researches have been made by Mr. F. Turville Petre of the British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. An exploration of the caves on the Mount of Olives and at *el-Isawiyyeh* has been carried out by Dr. E. L. Sukenik for the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The excavation of *Tell en-Nasbeh* (believed to be Mizpah) has rested since 1929, but we understand that Professor Badè expects to undertake an elaborate campaign there this next spring. Altogether the future is very promising for rich information from many quarters bearing on Israelite life and history.

## Contributions and Comments.

### A Footnote to Paul's Ephesian Ministry.

In a recent article, 'A New Setting for St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians' (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,

xlili. [1931], pp. 7-11), which recapitulates the chief contention of his most interesting book, entitled *St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry*, Professor G. S. Duncan ingeniously argues in favour of the theory that Paul wrote the so-called 'Imprisonment

Epistles' during various terms of imprisonment in *Ephesus*.

This theory, which would displace Rome as the scene of the Apostle's greatest literary activity, claims to account for some difficult passages of his autobiography; e.g. 1 Co 15<sup>32</sup> and 2 Co 11<sup>23</sup>; and, at the same time, to throw some much needed light on a most important but most obscure part of his missionary career.

Whether this attractive theory can be critically sustained has yet to be determined by a searching investigation of all the available material; and even if the final verdict is given in its favour, we must expect that public opinion will veer round to it but slowly after so long an acceptance of Rome as the prison city.

Without, for the meantime, committing ourselves to this new alignment of apostolic history, we may pass under review a detail which should have some bearing on the case, as it certainly has very considerable intrinsic interest.

In his *Epistle to the Ephesians*—probably written from Laodicea according to the new view—Paul uses forty-one words which are not found elsewhere in the New Testament. Twenty of these words are nouns; nine of which occur in chapter 6, where a virile military passage calls upon the Christian guard to arm itself against assaults of evil.

These nine nouns appear to have military associations; they are—

goodwill	6 <sup>7</sup>	an essential of true service.
wiles	6 <sup>11</sup>	which an enemy employs in warfare.
wrestling	6 <sup>12</sup>	a familiar pastime among soldiers in barracks.
world-rulers	6 <sup>12</sup>	such as directed the legions of Rome.
firm footing	6 <sup>15</sup>	as of military boots or sandals.
shield	6 <sup>16</sup>	the <i>scutum</i> , a large oblong shield used by fully armed panoplitæ.
dart	6 <sup>16</sup>	a missile cast at an enemy.
steadfastness	6 <sup>18</sup>	a prized virtue of military discipline.
an opening	6 <sup>19</sup>	suggestive of the open sea across which the legions passed to the Provinces.

When we review this special vocabulary we seem obliged to conclude that the Apostle must have picked it up during an exceptionally close connexion with Roman legionaries, whether in Cæsarea, or in Ephesus, or in Jerusalem, or on board the ill-fated

vessel of his last voyage to Rome, or in the metropolis itself.

These, however, are not the only words savouring of soldiery which occur in this Epistle but nowhere else in the New Testament. In chapter 4 occurs another group with seemingly similar suggestions. It contains the following:

to lead captive	4 <sup>8</sup>	a distinctively clear reference to a military 'triumph'; 'to lead captive' literally means 'to take with the spear.'
tossed to and fro	4 <sup>14</sup>	a word from the sea; 'tossed like waves.'
sleight	4 <sup>14</sup>	literally 'dice-playing,' a characteristic pastime of the legionary (cf. Mt 27 <sup>35</sup> ).
being past feeling	4 <sup>19</sup>	the callousness of the Roman soldier is proverbial.

The references in chapter 5<sup>4</sup> to facetiousness and foolish talking also recall familiar habits of the guard-room with the filthiness of speech which invariably went with them. (Compare also the allusion in 5<sup>12-14</sup> to the night life of the barracks and to the arousing *réveille* of the morning).

Since language enters into the work of historical reconstruction we must account for the Apostle's choice in *this Epistle* only of these words with distinctive military suggestion. Would there be any reason for this generous employment of words of this character unless Ephesus was in some way bound up in Paul's mind with special memories and associations of soldiery? Granted such special memories and experiences, and we have a luminous commentary on phrases and allusions which are not easily accounted for otherwise.

Dr. Duncan may have taken all these considerations into account, although he gives the Epistle to the Ephesians but scant notice in his book and in his more recent paper in this Journal; but in any case these details form an item which will have value in the effort to reach a true understanding of Paul's Ephesian ministry.

GEORGE L. HURST.

Buckingham, Quebec, Canada.

## The Entry into Jerusalem.

I HOPE that many besides myself have been led to Dr. Coffin's *The Meaning of the Cross* by Professor



Gossip's article on that book in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for July.

It is noticeable that Mr. Llynfi Davies, in the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES offers an exposition of our Lord's public entry into Jerusalem, which Dr. Coffin sees every reason to reject (cf. p. 88, etc.): 'HE is challenging attention'—'HE will give the leaders of the Church no chance to ignore Him'—'HE makes it impossible for them to overlook Him'—'HE must bring on the crisis in order that the Kingdom may come' (p. 91). Is not Mr. Llynfi Davies' suggestion negatived by the fact that our Lord Himself gave the instructions for the ass to be procured? THOMAS COOPER.

Birmingham.

## The Misplacement in Revelation i. 13, 14.

THE suggestion made by Professor J. Hugh Michael in the May issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES that λευκὸν ὡς χιὼν should be removed from Rev 1<sup>14</sup> and placed immediately after the word ποδῆρη in v. 13 receives reinforcement from 3<sup>4</sup>: 'You have a few persons at Sardis who (in the past crisis) did not defile their garments, and they shall walk with me in white ones, for they are worthy.' In the light of the fact that many of the descriptive phrases in the messages to the Churches are drawn from the vision of the glorified Christ which precedes them, it is only natural to conclude that περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς is based on 1<sup>13</sup> in its restored form (cf. ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἑπτὰ γυχνῶν τῶν χρυσεῶν in 2<sup>1</sup>).

C. CLARE OKE.

Windermere, Ontario.

## John Howe: A Puritan's Equipment for the Ministry.

JOHN HOWE, who was born at Loughborough on 17th May 1630, and who died in London on 2nd April 1705, is a splendid illustration of the width of disciplined culture which Puritanism, in its great days and at its best, encouraged in its ministers. In him we have the saint who also is the scholar, and the scholar who is also the preacher.

Howe was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, where he came under the influence of the 'Cambridge Platonists,' Henry More and Ralph Cudworth, and at Brasenose College, Oxford, where

he took his bachelor's degree in 1649. In 1652 he was elected a Fellow of Magdalen College, whose President was the great Puritan, Thomas Goodwin, Cromwell's favourite preacher and the first minister of the Church which now worships at the City Temple. It was here that Howe learnt those principles of Church life and government which led him into Nonconformity. Here, too, he read hard in ancient philosophy and patristic theology.

The range of his reading can be seen in the following list of authors whom he quotes in his first important book, *The Blessedness of Righteousness*: Homer; Plato and Aristotle (nine or ten times); Horace and Virgil; Cicero and Pliny; Seneca (over twenty times); Tacitus; Epicurus; Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus; Diogenes Laertius; Apuleius; Velleius Paterculus; Dionysius Halicarnassius; Q. Curtius; Philostratus; Philo; Proclus; Porphyrius; Plotinus; Maximus Tyrius.

The Fathers and early Church writers were closely studied. We find quotations from Minucius Felix; Gregory of Nyssa; Augustine; Boethius.

Again, there are allusions to Arnobius; the Italian Platonist, Marsilio Ficino; Peter Molina; Beza; Gibboeuf.

Then, we have it on the authority of Calamy that during this time Howe had 'thoroughly studied the Scriptures, and from thence had drawn up a body of divinity for himself and for his own use, which he saw very little occasion afterwards to vary from, in compliance with the schemes of others.'

It is clear that he had an intimate knowledge of his Greek Testament as well as an almost exhaustive knowledge of the English Bible, and that he had a fair acquaintance with Hebrew.

'Comparisons are dangerous,' wrote Dr. Horton in 1895, 'but it is not too much to affirm that very few young University men to-day at the time of taking orders, and still fewer Nonconformist ministers issuing from the Theological Colleges have anything like the same extent or depth of erudition. . . . The Puritan minister's mind was imbued with permanent literature, and the singular strength of his teaching, together with the apparently inexhaustible stores of thought and illustration, must be attributed to the patient discipline in the books which do not come and go, but have come and remain, amid the ceaseless ebb and flow of contemporary writings.'<sup>1</sup>

E. W. PRICE EVANS.

Pontypool.

<sup>1</sup> John Howe, pp. 12, 13.



## Entre Nous.

### A Disarmament Address: for Boys and Girls.

'They shall beat their swords into plowshares.'—Is 2<sup>d</sup>.

There is a story in the Bible about a man who offered to God a sacrifice from his farm, but the sacrifice was delayed and niggardly, and God would not accept it. His brother also offered a sacrifice, with which God was pleased. So Cain, for that was the man's name, was jealous and resolved to kill his brother. This he did, and then went away to build a great city. But the killing did not stop there, for men arose who desired to possess the city and they had to kill to capture it. And the inhabitants had to kill some of the invaders in defence. Now in some such way war first began, and so it has been going on for centuries, and will go on unless we can find some means to put an end to it.

The proposal to hold a Disarmament Conference is a sign that the world has realized the truth of this. The words of the old Prophet, 'They shall beat their swords into plow-shares,' have become a necessity of civilization. The 'sword' is the symbol of war, and from its crude forms war has developed into a great science involving enormous sums of money. If Isaiah could speak in his day of 'learning war no more,' in what terms must we speak when all the finest scientific brains have been devoted to it? At its best war is a perversion of work, and it lets loose some of the basest passions of our being. The 'ploughshare' is the symbol of agriculture, and it might well be the symbol of man in his first and finest employment. But the scientific brains have not been devoted to agriculture that have been given to war, nor have the same imagination and money. I wonder why we hold the soldier in higher esteem than the farmer, when we think of the harvest of the soldier compared with that of the farmer?

The words 'sword' and 'ploughshare' are curiously related. Both are Anglo-Saxon words in origin. The 'share,' or dividing portion of the plough, early suggested the 'sword' as an instrument for killing. The first implements of war were transformed agricultural instruments. But battlefields are of more than one kind. There are economic, industrial, commercial, social battlefields in which war is waged. Now when we think of the world of business, we find that the very words used there daily are curiously related to agriculture. The words 'share,' 'bull,' 'bear,'

'corner,' 'stock,' 'dividend' are agricultural words with a perverted meaning. The 'share' of agriculture becomes the 'sword' of business and the manipulation of 'shares' takes the place of the manipulation of the ploughshare. But while the farmer may seem unimportant as compared with either the man of big business or the soldier, we ask what is the harvest of each? 'By their fruits are they known' is what our Lord says.

Part of the harvest of agriculture is work, but the harvest of war is unemployment. The harvest we reap to-day from the past is that of the 'sword.' It is one of War Debts, of millions out of work, of food prices out of proportion to the wealth of food provided by God for the world's use. And thirteen years after the Great War, which was called a war to end war, the world is spending six hundred times the sum on arming that it is spending on the League of Nations. Seeing that war has such a harvest, the time is surely ripe for turning our swords into ploughshares. We must pray that God may bless all efforts to uproot the roots of war, and we must sow for a fresh harvest of peace and labour, of national security, of arbitration in disputes, and above all for a harvest of the religion of Jesus Christ, which is love. We must devote the best scientific brains to agriculture, and the best business brains to the distribution of the fruits of the earth. Let us catch the vision of the old Prophet who saw a Golden Age and dared to speak of it! And having caught the vision, let us *work* for the Golden Harvest. The swords have to be *beaten* into ploughshares. The League of Nations is beating the swords, so is the Church. Will all the boys and girls lend a hand too?

### Sinclair Stevenson.

Few men have had more friends than the Reverend John Sinclair Stevenson, and so the title of his biography, *Do you remember Sinclair Stevenson?* He had a great joy in social Christian fellowship, and with his lightness of heart—W. E. S. Holland called him a miracle of gaiety—he combined infinite thought for making other people happy. His father was Dr. Fleming Stevenson of Dublin, a well-known and well-loved Presbyterian minister. Sinclair Stevenson had a story about his father which he delighted to tell against himself. When he was on deputation work a kind lady said to him, 'I heard your father once; he was a beautiful speaker; you must be very like your mother.'



The oldest son, Sinclair Stevenson was born in Dublin in 1868, and educated at Clifton and Lincoln College, Oxford. Those were the early days of the Student Christian Union in Oxford, and he was one of the first members. The methods of work were those of the 'eighties, and included the giving away of tracts. 'Dr. P. S. Allen once saw him at work: "One vivid recollection I have is of his standing in Christ Church meadow just at the entrance to the Grove, and distributing tracts to the stream of gay people coming up from the Eights; a little shy, perhaps, but his own steady self, doing what he thought right, though aware that others might laugh, at such a time of festivity. . . . Then he went off to India, and I saw him no more till you came to Oxford in 1925, wasn't it? But we were in India during the famine of 1900, and I remember reading an account of his work, and glowing to think I had some claim to call such a man my friend."

Stevenson was twenty-six when he went to India as a missionary of the Irish Presbyterian Church. He was stationed successively in Surat, Ahmedabad, Deesa, Parantij, Rajkot, and Parantij again. He went through all the terrible famine of 1900, and the pictures of the famine which Mrs. Stevenson gives—for this memoir is written by Mr. Stevenson's wife—are unforgettable. We can only quote a few sentences. 'The mortality amongst the Indian children was frightful. Many of them came to the orphanages in a dying condition, for to starvation they had added terrible internal infection from the filth and putrefying garbage they had eaten. Clair said that he hardly ever was able to save a child who had started eating earth before it came to him. Another pathetic thing was that the children could not believe that they were going to have another meal the next day, and so always saved a little bit and hid it under their bedding.'

In 1925 Mr. Stevenson's health failed, and he was obliged to leave India, but the last years were full of work with the Irish Christian Fellowship—the Irish Copec. An address which he gave in the great Presbyterian Hall in Belfast to missionaries leaving for the foreign field comprised his own whole philosophy of missions. 'You go as learners,' he said—the customs and religious beliefs of the people have to be studied 'if you want to understand the ways in which men are feeling after God. . . . In the second place you go as friends. I think nothing strikes the newcomer more than the general friendliness of people in India. . . . And one thing you will soon discover and realize more

and more day by day: that what you do or say matters less than what you are, and what you become is more important than what you accomplish.

'And lastly, may I remind you that you go as messengers, and all your humble learning, and all your love and friendship will be of little use if you have no message to deliver, for after all the main object of our going is that we may introduce people to the greatest of Friends. And if that is so, we must take pains to get to know Him better ourselves. It is an extraordinary thing, but all of us who have been on the mission field can bear witness out of bitter experience that the prayer life, while it is the most essential part of our work, is the most easily crowded out. Let anything go rather than that.'

Sinclair Stevenson wrote three books for children that have been widely read and enjoyed. The first was a life of Christ—'The Friend of Little Children.' The second was the story of the New Testament—'The Knights of a Great Prince,' and the third was a Church history for children—'A King's Champions.' They were all written in letters home to his little daughter, Bridget, whom he had to send to England at the age of two. A delightful story is told as one of the happy memories of the last few days which she spent in India. 'Clair was reading from the lectern in church the story of the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem. Noticing the get-at-ability of her adored play-fellow, the little child slipped unobserved from her seat and toddled up to where he stood. Clair never stopped reading, but just put a hand down. The little mite grabbed it with glee and stood there as good as gold during the long lesson. Only just to show that she was attending, whenever the word for ass was read she gave a loud hee-haw.'

This is a good biography—the second half is even better than the first, for in it Mrs. Stevenson writes of the events of which she had personal knowledge.

The biography is published by Messrs. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, price 6s. net.

#### Ways of Approach.

How many ways are there into the fellowship of God? Dr. Herbert Gray wrote to a number of his friends and asked if they would tell him simply how God became known to them. In their answers he found eight ways of approach. 'I came through a process of thinking to believe in a personal God,' one man wrote. But if he discovered God through reason, more discovered Him through beauty. And others came to Him through defeat—the



essential step being an act of surrender. And others again found God through meeting the challenge of the world. One man wrote: 'The loudest and the clearest thing God ever said to me was said in the slums of a great city, and took the form of an insistent call that I should find a way of doing something to remove that blot upon the dignity of man and that insult to God.' For others the way was simply through Christ—every look at Christ made God real. Dr. Gray knows of no limitations to this way. 'But they must take all that Christ has to give if they are to know all of God that can be known. And very few of us do that. We have our favourite aspect of Christ, and our favourite Gospel chapters.'

And there is the way through suffering—Dr. Gray tells the story of a man whom he used to visit whose sufferings left him tormented. 'He would have seemed to many an incarnate disproof of any faith that testifies to a good God. But his account of the situation was very different. "While I had my health I wasted it in sin, and when all my old pleasures were taken away from me, I asked myself, 'What is there left for me?' Then I turned to God, and found His love. I am glad that things have happened in this way.'"

The last way of approach is through fellowship with a religious basis. This for some men created a set of conditions in which their spiritual faculties awoke.

We are asked sometimes to recommend a book which shall be suggestive for Bible Class work. When that request comes again we shall recommend *Finding God* (S.C.M. ; 4s. net), and perhaps the most suggestive part of the book is not what we have outlined, but that in which Dr. Gray deals with the limitations of the religion of those who are, content with the one great experience which changed them. For it is not enough to find God. He must be re-discovered all through life. 'I have tried,' says Dr. Gray, 'to keep myself out of this book and to allow others to speak through me. And I do not want to spoil it now. Yet I would like to insert this witness. As I look back over my life I realise that I have travelled at different times at least in some measure on all the roads of which I have written. I have been greatly blessed in

my friends, and again and again some new friend has opened up to me some new truth or led me along some new road of spiritual adventure. And so, and so only, has my religion remained a thing of ever-growing interest.'

#### Remaining an Evangelist.

I would even hazard the suggestion that it is a dangerous thing for anybody to remain an evangelist, and only an evangelist, throughout life. After periods spent in direct efforts to 'win souls'—that greatest of human activities—it would seem to me a healthy thing that men or women should settle down for a while to hard and practical efforts to render service of other kinds: getting into close contact with the sufferers of the world, or laying hands on some section of life that they may try to change it according to the pattern of Christ. I think that in that way some of the balance that was in the life of Christ might be achieved. I think also that in that way people with spiritual enthusiasms might be kept in a very wholesome contact with reality.<sup>1</sup>

#### Freak Religions.

Incidentally, it is very remarkable how many of these people who turn away from religion are found ultimately in the ranks of those who cultivate 'freak' religions, and how, having been unmoved by that majestic conception of the universe and of life which the New Testament expounds and which experience confirms, they become the eager exponents of strange, fantastic notions which healthy and normal thinkers abhor. Some of them are even heard declaring in slightly altered words the very truths which in churches they heard unmoved. One feels about them that they were at war with a vocabulary, while all the time they were in truth hungry for God.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Gray, *Finding God*, 67.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.